DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 313 769 EA 021 205

AUTHOR Schofer, Richard C.; And Others
TITLE The Missouri Career Development and Teacher Excellence Plan: An Initial Study of Missouri's Career Ladder Program. A Technical Report.
INSTITUTION Missouri Univ., Columbia. Coll. of Education.
SPONS AGENCY Missouri House of Representatives, Jefferson City.; Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Jan 87
NOTE 159p.; Appendices B through E consist of photoreduced survey forms.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Career Ladders; Change Strategies; *Educational Development; Elementary Secondary Education; Excellence in Education; *Incentives; *Motivation Techniques; *State Programs; Teacher Employment; *Teacher Improvement; Teaching (Occupation); Work Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Missouri

ABSTRACT

The Missouri Plan provides for direct participation of teachers in the planning, development, and implementation of the district career ladder plan. This study analyzed the appropriateness of the Missouri teacher incentive plan. In particular, the study sought to determine why districts did or did not choose to implement career ladder programs; the attitudes of educational personnel regarding career ladders; and the potential positive or negative impact of career ladders on Missouri education. A total of 1,700 surveys were returned; in addition, 50 superintendents were interviewed by telephone. Findings indicate that school districts that chose to participate had made the decision to implement a career ladder plan on the participative model suggested by the state. The overriding factor in the decision to have a district career ladder plan was money. The attitudes about career ladders and their impact on the future of education were positive in participating districts, and a significant number of school districts report that they are considering implementation. Appended are (1) Missouri Statutes 168.500-168.520; (2) questionnaires; (3) matrix of common questions; (4) telephone interview instruments; (5) demographic data table; and (6) Missouri Carrer Ladder Model. (SI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

THE MISSOURI CAREER DEVELOPMENT AND TEACHER EXCELLENCE PLAN:

AN INITIAL STUDY OF MISSOURI'S CAREER LADDER PROGRAM

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. D. Jackson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 021 205

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE MISSOURI CAREER DEVELOPMENT AND TEACHER EXCELLENCE PLAN:

AN INITIAL STUDY OF MISSOURI'S CAREER LADDER PROGRAM

A Technical Report
Prepared For
The Missouri House of Representatives
Bob F. Griffin, Speaker

January, 1987

Office of Research and Development
College of Education
University of Missouri-Columbia

Richard C. Schofer
Project Director

Jerry W. Valentine
Project Coordinator

Jeanette C. Murphy
Research Associate

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The Missouri House of Representatives contracted with the Office of Research and Development of the University of Missouri College of Education to conduct research on the state career ladder plan and to prepare a technical report of that research. Funds for the contract were obtained through a grant to the House by the National Conference of State Legislatures and the Office of Educational Research and Improvement of the U. S. Department of Education.

The House Research Staff has exercised general oversight of the project, drawing up contract specifications, reviewing research design and survey instruments, and editing the report for publication.

B. Darrell Jackson, Director of Research

Anne C. Walker, Assistant Director of Research and Analyst for Education

Missouri House of Representatives

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purposes of this study of the Missouri Career Ladder plan were:

(1) to determine why districts chose to implement or not implement career ladder programs and the methods used to make those decisions;

(2) to determine the attitudes of educational personnel across the state regarding career ladders; and

(3) to determine educators' perceptions of the potential impact of career ladders upon Missouri education.

To accomplish these goals, school districts participating and not participating in career ladder programs were studied. From the 66 participating school districts, survey data were gathered from teachers, principals, superintendents and board presidents to identify procedures used to make career ladder decisions and to determine attitudes about specific issues associated with career ladders. A nonparticipating group of 66 school districts was identified to test for contrasting differences. Superintendents and board presidents from all other school districts in the state were also surveyed. Data descriptive of the size and wealth of each district of the state were also analyzed to identify characteristics of

participating and nonparticipating districts and determine whether there are significant differences. Data for this study were collected in the months of September, October and November, 1986, the first three months of implementation of the Missouri Career Ladder Program.

Over 1,700 surveys were returned, tabulated and analyzed. In addition, 50 superintendents were interviewed by telephone. The surveys and interviews give a picture of what has occurred and is occurring in Missouri school districts on the career ladder plan.

(1) The school districts which have chosen to participate have closely followed the direction of the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, which has served as the main source of information to the districts on the career ladder. These districts have made their decisions to implement a career ladder plan on the participative model suggested by the state, involving teachers, administrators, and patrons in the decision. They have also adopted the state model plan, with only a few making modifications in the model.

(2) The overriding factor in the decision to have a district career ladder plan is money. It is realized by respondents that instruction may be improved and that good teachers may be encouraged to remain in the profession as a result of the career ladder. But the decision was seen by

both administrators and teachers as based primarily on the opportunity to supplement the local salary structure for teachers. When this supplement would be funded less by state money than by local money, a district was less likely to choose to have a career ladder plan. Some districts sought additional local money in the form of a levy increase and decided not to implement a career ladder plan when the district's voters rejected the increase.

(3) Although a number of widely shared attitudes and characteristics are discovered by the study, there are also important differences between participating and nonparticipating districts and among the various personnel groups. Participating districts are smaller and have less wealth than nonparticipating districts. The attitudes about career ladders and their impact on the future of education were more positive in participating districts. An example of differences between groups is that far fewer teachers think the amount of the salary supplements for the three career ladder stages (1,500, $3,000, and $5,000) are adequate than do superintendents.

(4) The initial reaction of many to the low participation rate in this voluntary program was disappointment. But while there are barriers to 100% participation by the state's school districts, there are reasons for believing that the career ladder program will

grow. A significant number of school districts report that they are considering implementation. The decision not to participate in the 1986-87 school year was not only a result of natural caution about a new program, it was also a result of the relative inefficiency of the recommended decision method. A unilateral board or administrative decision can be made quickly. A broadly based decision takes more time and effort. There is sufficient optimism about the value of the career ladder that when the decision making process has more time to work itself out, there will be significantly more districts participating in this method of recognizing and retaining the state's best teachers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	i
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ii
INTRODUCTION	1
I. LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND	4
II. PURPOSE AND DESIGN OF THE STUDY	7
III. DECISION MAKING	14
A. Information Sources	14
B. Decision-Making Process	16
C. Decisions on Future Involvement	17
D. Rationale for Participation	19
IV. ATTITUDES ABOUT CAREER LADDERS	22
A. Attitudes and Perceptions	22
B. Performance Based Evaluation	24
C. Perceived Motivators for Participation	26
V. DEMOGRAPHIC DATA	27
VI. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	29
VII. CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION	34

APPENDICES

A. Missouri Statutes 168.500 - 168.520
B. Questionnaires
C. Matrix of Common Questions
D. Telephone Interview Instruments
E. Demographic Data Table
F. Missouri Career Ladder Model

LIST OF TABLES

Following Page

Table 1.....Percentage Rate of Survey Returns.....10

Table 2.....Format of Survey Instrument Forms.....10

Table 3.....Information about Career Ladders.....14

Table 4.....Influences.....14

Table 5.....Process for Decision-Making.....16

Table 6.....Reasons for Decision.....17

Table 7.....Career Ladder Attitudes.....22

Table 8.....Teacher Motivation for Participation in DCLP....26

Table 9.....Demographic Data.....27

Table 10.....Distribution of Districts by Funding Brackets...28

INTRODUCTION

The April, 1983, report, A Nation At Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform, by the National Commission on Excellence in Education spawned numerous local and state studies and several other national studies analyzing the status of education and the directions education should take in the latter years of this century. A rebirth of teacher incentives seemed to occur from these countless reports. Voluntary and unlimited involvement, participative management, and differentiated, productivity-based responsibilities were characteristic of the new incentive plans, typically called "career ladders." The characteristics contrasted with the more typical, previous incentive efforts for teachers. Often described as "merit pay," the previous plans rewarded a small percentage of teachers, were non-voluntary, were administratively managed, rewarded past performance, and often promoted dissension among the "haves and have-nots." Merit pay has been minimally successful, at best.

The debates continue in virtually every state and in most school systems across the United States. How can education attract and retain quality teachers? Many suggestions have been made, including more amenable working

conditions, increased clerical and teaching assistance in the classroom, and smaller pupil-teacher ratios. Though no one who intelligently assesses the career ladder concept would consider the idea a panacea, it may hold promise for educational reform. Some states, Missouri included, have adopted educational plans designed to address the concerns of teacher quality and retention. Some plans mandate participation by all school systems in the state; others provide for voluntary participation. Some mandate specific "models"; others permit development of individual models by the local district.

The Missouri Career Development and Teacher Excellence Plan provides for voluntary involvement and district-developed plans administered through the auspices of the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. The Missouri Plan provides for direct participation of teachers in the planning, development, and implementation of the district career ladder plan. The Missouri legislation authorizing this program went into effect with the beginning of the 1986 school year. Of the 545 school systems across the state, 66 public school districts presented formal plans to the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education for approval.

In a general sense, this study was designed to analyze the appropriateness of the Missouri teacher incentive plan.

More specifically, the study sought to determine why districts chose to implement or not implement career ladder programs, to determine the methods used to make those decisions, to determine the attitudes of educational personnel across the state regarding career ladders and to ascertain the potential positive or negative impact of career ladders on Missouri education.

In the report which follows, the Missouri Career Ladder Plan is more fully described, the design of this study is presented, and the detailed findings are presented. The findings are presented in three major groupings: (1) the process which led to the decision to participate or not participate in the plan; (2) general attitudes of personnel regarding career ladders and the potential impact of career ladders upon education; and (3) demographic characteristics of participating and nonparticipating districts. A summary provides a listing of the most significant findings and a discussion of those findings.

I. LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

The Missouri Excellence in Education Act of 1985 was passed by the General Assembly in the spring of 1985. A cooperative effort of the Joint Education Committee of the Missouri House of Representatives and the Missouri Senate, the legislation represented th most comprehensive educational reform legislation in Missouri history. Statutory sections 168.500 through 168.520 from the Act (Appendix A) were the "Career Development and Teacher Excellence Plan," commonly called the Missouri Career Ladder Plan.

The Act makes participation in the Career Ladder Plan optional for school districts and teachers. Through monetary and productivity incentives, the Plan is designed to retain the experienced teacher, librarian or counselor in the mainstream of educational learning, i.e., in the classroom and classroom related activities. Funding for the program in each district is to be on a shared state/local basis with a variable matching formula depending upon school district wealth as measured by adjusted equalized assessed valuation, a component of the state foundation formula. The more able the district is to support the program, the less the match from the state is and vice versa.

In compliance with legislative provisions, a Missouri Career Ladder Advisory Committee was appointed by the State Board of Education to develop operational guidelines and a suggested career ladder model for the school districts of the state. The committee met monthly from the summer of 1985 through February, 1986. The committee's work was approved by the State Board of Education in April, 1986 and published that same month by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education in a manual entitled The Missouri Career Development and Teacher Excellence Plan: Suggested Guidelines for Career Ladder Programs in Missouri Public Schools, typically referred to as the Missouri Career Ladder Manual.

To meet the provisions of the Excellence in Education Act of 1985 and the operational guidelines as approved by the State Board of Education, a district career ladder plan must meet criteria described in the Missouri Career Ladder Manual. Essentially, these criteria require:

-- involvement of a local career ladder committee to develop the district career ladder plan;
-- statement of goals and purposes of the local career ladder plan;
-- identification of qualifications and responsibilities of participants for each stage in the plan;

-- linkage with the district's performance evaluation process;
-- procedures for appealing career ladder decisions;
-- methods for accommodating teacher mobility;
-- periodic evaluation of the career ladder plan;
-- assurances that a quota system will not be used; and
-- implementation of the plan through a district career ladder committee.

In accordance with the Act a district's career ladder model must include three career stages, each with increasingly more significant qualifications and responsibilities. The first stage provides $1,500 per year for each participating teacher, the second provides $3,000 and the third provides $5,000. The district career ladder plan must be approved by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education for the district to receive matching funds from the state. For the 1986-87 school year, 66 of the state's 545 school districts (12%) applied for participation and were beginning implementation of the program when this study was conducted.

This relatively low percentage of participation (i.e., 12%) has raised questions about the viability of the Career Development and Teacher Excellence Plan. As conceived and being implemented, is the plan appropriate for school systems? Have school systems had adequate time to properly address the concept and decide about participation? Is the

prevailing financial situation and climate in most districts such that providing matching monies through a tax referendum is difficult? Are there attitudes among educational personnel that preclude the success of a career ladder plan? If so, what factors may have shaped those attitudes and what might be done to promote more receptive attitudes? Are the attitudes of educators such that incentive plans of any nature are not considered viable approaches to attracting and maintaining quality teachers?

II. PURPOSE AND DESIGN OF THE STUDY

To conduct a thorough study of an issue as complex as the state-wide implementation of career ladders will require data from several years of research. However, initial data and perceptions can be analyzed in an effort to answer some of the questions stated above. This initial study of the Missouri Career Ladder Plan was made during the first few months of the program. Questions asked and issues analyzed were those deemed most appropriate at the time of the study.

As previously mentioned, the general purpose of this study was to analyze the appropriateness of the Career Development and Teacher Excellence Plan. The specific purposes of the study were:

(1) to determine why districts chose to implement or not implement career ladder programs and the methods used to make those decisions;

(2) to determine the attitudes of educational personnel across the state regarding career ladders; and,

(3) to determine educators' perceptions of the potential impact of career ladders upon Missouri education.

To accomplish these purposes, a study was designed to gather data about participating and nonparticipating school systems. A detailed set of survey questions were developed by the research team. Teachers, principals, superintendents and school board presidents were surveyed using questions developed around the same issues, but worded appropriately for each survey group. Follow-up telephone interviews were conducted with randomly selected superintendents. Numerous demographic characteristics which might be associated with career ladder issues were also analyzed.

The data collection steps used in this study are outlined below.

(1) From the 66 school systems which had applied for participation in the career ladder program for the 1986-87 school year at the time this study began,

each principal (176), superintendent (66) and school board president (66) was mailed a questionnaire.

(2) From the 66 districts applying for participation, 1,000 teachers were randomly selected from the total population of 4,062 in those districts and mailed a questionnaire.

(3) From the 479 districts not applying for participation in the career ladder program at the time this study began, 66 districts were randomly selected. Each principal (219), superintendent (66) and school board president (66) from these 66 districts was mailed a questionnaire.

(4) From the 66 nonparticipating school districts selected in #3 above, 1,000 teachers were randomly selected from the population of 6,858 in those districts and mailed a questionnaire.

(5) From the 413 school systems not otherwise sampled, each superintendent (413) and school board president (413) was mailed a questionnaire.

(6) From the 66 participating school districts, 25 superintendents were randomly selected for telephone interviews.

(7) From the 66 nonparticipating school districts selected in #3 above, 25 superintendents were randomly selected for telephone interviews.

(8) From all school systems in the state, specific demographic data were collected and analyzed, including data related to district size and wealth which might be associated with the decision to participate in career ladders.

In all, 545 superintendents and board presidents, 395 principals and 2,000 teachers were mailed questionnaires and asked to participate in the study. Table 1 provides a description of the response rates for each group surveyed. Also included in Table 1 is the number of responses needed to have a confidence level of 95%. The Mail column is the number of persons surveyed, the Need column represents the desired number of responses for a 95% confidence level, the Return column is the number of useable responses, and the % column is the percentage of returns.

As can be seen from Table 1, the highest response rate occurred in the principal groups of both the participating and nonparticipating districts and the lowest came from the board presidents. The participating superintendents and both board president groups did not provide enough responses to meet the desired level of confidence for those groups. However, the 62% and 64% return rates for superintendents

Table 1

Percentage Rate of Survey Returns

Group	Participating Mail	Need	Return	%	Non-Participating Mail	Need	Return	%
Teachers	1,000	278	529	53%	1,000	278	514	51%
Principals	176	123	157	89%	219	140	207	95%
Superintendents	66	57	41	62%	479	214	307	64%
Board Presidents	66	57	19	29%	479	214	130	27%

Table 2

Format of Survey Instrument Forms

Participating School Districts (P)*		Non-Participating School Districts (NP)	
Teacher Form	(TP)	Teacher Form	(TNP)
Principal Form	(PP)	Principal Form	(PNP)
Superintendent Form	(SP)	Superintendent Form	(SNP)
Board President Form	(BP)	Board President Form	(BNP)

*(Note: Throughout the discussion of the findings, the abbreviations in parentheses in Table 2 will be used with percentages to indicate the group and category.)

are large enough to be useful. The return rates for school board presidents are so low, caution should be exercised in assuming the responses represent the total population.

The Career Ladder legislation was passed in 1985 for implementation beginning in the fall, 1986. School districts were to make application during the summer of 1986, though some applications were still being discussed and negotiated during late summer and early fall. The survey data for this study were collected during the months of September, October and November, 1986. Because there were so few responses from board presidents, a follow-up letter was mailed to the board of education presidents.

Subsequent to the beginning of this study, two school systems either withdrew their applications or were not approved for the career ladder program by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. Since data collection procedures were anonymous and had begun by that time, it was impossible to identify the data from the two districts. Because the two districts had to be included in the survey data, they were included for consistency in the demographic, non-survey analyses.

Mail survey instruments were developed to obtain data about specific school district size and wealth issues and perceptions regarding career ladders in general and Missouri's Career Ladder Plan specifically. Although the

majority of questions were common to all four groups of the participating and nonparticipating school districts, (Teachers, Principals, Superintendents, Board of Education Presidents), some questions were specific to one group. Including all items on one form with multiple directions as to which questions were appropriate to which respondent was determined by the researchers to be confusing and have the potential to lead to erroneous data. Therefore, a separate questionnaire form for each of the four groups of school personnel within the categories of participating and nonparticipating districts was developed. As depicted in Table 2, each group and respective questionnaire form was identified by a code letter. Because these abbreviated codes are used throughout this report and on the questionnaires, they are listed in Table 2. Appendix B contains a copy of each questionnaire and Appendix C is a matrix identifying the questions common to all groups or common to specific groups.

During early December, 1986, fifty superintendents were randomly selected for follow-up telephone interviews, twenty-five from the sixty-six "participating" districts and twenty-five from the sixty-six "nonparticipating" districts. The interviews were conducted to validate the questionnaire responses and to gather more specific opinions and comments about career ladders. A structured interview

format was followed using eleven interview questions for the "participating" superintendents and ten for the "nonparticipating" superintendents. The same interviewer was used for all interviews and was trained in the techniques of telephone interviewing, including probing for additional data when appropriate. Appendix D includes copies of the interview instruments.

The surveys mailed to superintendents provided some demographic data about school district size and wealth. However, complete data gathered by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, School Data Division, through department classification reports, provided a basis for specific comparisons between the sixty-six participating and the remaining nonparticipating districts on a variety of size and wealth issues possibly related to the decision to participate in career ladders. Demographic data from mail-survey respondents are provided in Appendix E. Demographic data from the classification reports are presented and discussed in Section V of this report.

III. DECISION MAKING

Many factors influence a decision when a complex issue must be resolved. The decision by a board of education and school system administration to participate in a career ladder program is a complex decision and should not be oversimplified. To assess the judgments about participation or nonparticipation, teachers, principals, superintendents and board presidents were asked several questions regarding the process used to determine participation. The questions were systematic, moving from knowledge about career ladders, to the influences on the decision and the procedures used to make the decision.

A. Information Sources

Table 3 lists the sources from which respondents obtained their initial information about career ladders and the Career Ladder Plan. Teachers most frequently gained their initial exposure through informal discussions with colleagues. Each certificated group, except the superintendents, learned from their supervisor, i.e., teachers from principals, and principals from superintendents. Board presidents indicated their superintendents and professional organization meetings were

Table 3

Information About Career Ladders
(Percentages by Source and Group)

	Teachers		Principals		Board		Supts	
Source	TNP	TP	PNP	PP	BNP	BP	SNP	SP
	N = 932		N = 231		N = 166		N = 366	
Informal discussions with colleagues	62	60					52	
Professional Organization meetings	39	38	46	39			51	39
Supervisors (Supt/Prin)	42	58	50	49	57	78		
DESE bulletins			47	41	44	35	73	80
DESE workshops							43	33

Note: All responses represent percentages.

Table 4

Influences

Two-Way ANOVA-GLM Model
Least Squares Means
N = 1699

		Board		Principal		Superintendent		Teacher	
Variable	n	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P
Publicity	1685	3.0	3.1	2.8	2.8	2.6	3.1*	2.7	2.8*
DESE	1686	3.4	3.5	3.3	3.6*	3.4	3.7*	3.0	3.2*
Superintendent	165	3.3	4.3*						

Note: Asterisk = significant differences between NP and P groups.

helpful in learning about the Career Ladder Plan. The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education was an important source of information to all respondents, particularly superintendents.

Respondents were asked the "degree to which specific issues affected their opinions about career ladders." Superintendents and board presidents were more influenced by publicity from other districts or states than were teachers or principals. All groups of respondents were more highly influenced by the Department than by publicity from other districts or states. Superintendents had the greatest influence on board presidents, particularly presidents of districts which participated in the career ladder program. The tests of differences between groups indicated significantly more positive influence by publicity from other districts and states and by the Department in districts implementing career ladders. The responses are summarized in Table 4.

Superintendents, and to a lesser degree board presidents, were most frequently formally introduced to the Career Ladder Plan through workshops sponsored by the Department. In participating districts, teachers and principals were introduced through district workshops, while most nonparticipating teachers and one-third of the

nonparticipating principals indicated no formal introduction to the career ladder plan.

B. Decision-Making Process

The process used by school districts to develop a Career Ladder Program was mandated through the guidelines established by the Department's Career Ladder Committee and approved by the State Board of Education. The guidelines suggested that "the local board of education should establish a committee composed of teachers, administrators, and patrons charged with the responsibility of developing the District Career Ladder Plan (DCLP)." The guidelines further suggested "that teachers select the teachers to serve on such a committee." As depicted in Table 5, respondents from participating districts consistently indicated that a district committee studied Career Ladder issues and models and made a recommendation to the board. Many nonparticipating districts also used a district committee to study the issue of career ladders and make a recommendation to participate or not participate to the board of education. The decision in nonparticipating districts not to participate was also frequently made by the central office and recommended to the board without involvement of teachers and principals.

Table 5

Process for Decision-Making
Responses in Percentages

Source	TNP	TP	PNP	PP	BNP	BP	SNP	SP
	N = 906		N = 225		N = 162		N = 365	
Teacher, Principal, Central Office Committee	21	86	33	82	26	88	38	88
Principal, Central Office Committee	5	1	3	1	4	0	5	0
Principal Committee	2	0	1	1	1	0	4	2
District Adminis.	17	3	20	0	19	0	20	0
Board w/o Input	9	0	8	0	19	0	5	0

C. Decisions on Future Involvement

If districts are not participating in career ladders during the 1986-87 year, are they studying the issue and considering participation in the near future? Superintendents of nonparticipating districts were asked on the written survey if their district had a committee currently studying a career ladder system: 44% responded "Yes" and 56% said "No." These same superintendents were also asked if they believed their district would implement a career ladder plan during the 1987-88 school year: 23% said "Yes" and 77% selected "No." Thus, superintendents of approximately half of the districts now studying the career ladder issue expect their districts to adopt a career ladder plan in the 1987-88 year. If those percentages were generalized to the total population of 479 districts not currently implementing career ladders, 210 districts would be currently studying the issue and 110 districts would be implementing a career ladder program in the 1987-88 school year. The total number of districts participating in the program during 1987-88 would, therefore, by this method of projection, be approximately 175, nearly three times as many as during the 1986-87 school year. The failure of tax levies would reduce this number. (Table 6 below shows that 5% of superintendents in nonparticipating districts list

Table 6
Reasons for Decision
Chosen Responses in Percentages

Reason	TNP N=396	TP N=538	PNP N=117	PP N=117	BNP N=140	BP N=26	SNP N=317	SP N=51
Because it is available		25		11		100		4
Recognition of teachers		17		26		27		25
All teachers would not be recognized	23		21					
Just a few would be recognized					5		7	
Another way of getting extra dollars		57		57		50		43
Encourage excellence in education		39		55		50		71
Would not encourage excellence in educ.	15		18					
Would enhance student learning		11		18		19		35
Would not enhance student learning	17		15					

Table 6 (Continued)
Reasons for Decision
Chosen Responses in Percentages

Reason	TNP N=396	TP N=538	PNP N=117	PP N=117	BNP N=140	BP N=26	SNP N=317	SP N=51
Not certain it would increase student learning					25		21	
Percent of state contribution was a factor	32	51	32	39	37	35	43	49
Political Pressure	4	6	7	2	1		1	2
Teachers in favor of participation		23		28		46		27
Teachers resistance to participation	41		37		28		45	
Administrators in favor of participation		17		14		19		8
Administrators resistant to participation	22		15					
Superintendent recommendation	15	21	20	17		23		8
Superintendent recommended against it					17		9	
To attract qualified teachers when vacancies occur		4		11		15		10
Would not help to attract qualified teachers	6		3					
Criteria were not adequate					11		12	

Table 6 (Continued)

Reasons for Decision
Chosen Responses in Percentages

Reason	TNP N=396	TP N=538	PNP N=117	PP N=117	BNP N=140	BP N=26	SNP N=317	SP N=51
Uncertainty about outcome for low performance teachers					3		3	
Differences in opinion among members of the Board of Education					10		5	
Would take too much time to plan					1		6	
Would take too much time to implement					4		5	
Would create an elite group of teachers					10		7	
Future costs contained in the Excellence in Education Act					32		31	
The possibility of the state lowering the stipend					16		17	
Voters voted down the levy					4		5	
Lack of interest shown by the Board of Education					9		10	

failure of a levy increase as a reason for not participating.)

When asked in the interview if they believed their district would implement a career ladder plan in the 1987-88 school year, 3 of the 25 nonparticipating superintendents said "Yes," 12 responded "No," 10 responded "Not Sure." When asked if they believed their district would implement a career ladder plan sometime in the future, 5 said "Yes," 11 said "No," and 9 chose "Not Sure." The most common reasons given for selecting "No" were: "nobody qualifies because of too many new teachers"; "there's no interest"; "how will I explain it to those who don't qualify"; and "not if it has the same guidelines."

Understanding the types of career plans adopted by participating districts can be valuable to these districts considering a career ladder plan in the future. Respondents were provided with copies of the Missouri Career Ladder Model and asked to compare their District Career Ladder Plan with the state model. Approximately 75% of all respondents described their district plan as a modified version of the Missouri Career Ladder Plan Model. Of the twenty-five participating superintendents interviewed several described the modifications as changes within the responsibilities area of Stages II and III. The use of a weighted point

system for tasks with a certain number of total points to be earned appeared to be the most prevalent modification.

D. Rationale for Participation

Principals, superintendents, and board presidents of participating and nonparticipating districts were asked specifically about the importance of "supplementing teacher salaries" in the decision. Participating groups were asked "to what degree was the opportunity to supplement current teacher salaries an important factor leading to the decision to implement a district career ladder plan?" Sixty-eight percent expressed "highly important" and only 3% indicated "not important." The nonparticipating groups were asked to respond Yes-No to the statement "One of the most important factors leading to the decision not to implement a district career ladder plan was the increased cost to the district in order to supplement current teacher salaries." Sixty-four percent indicated that increased cost was an important factor in deciding not to participate.

All respondents were asked to select three responses which best described why their district decided to implement or not implement a career ladder plan. Table 6 gives the percentage of respondents selecting each reason for or against participation. The primary reason given by all

respondents in districts implementing career ladder plans was the "availability" of the plan as a means of "getting more (salary) money." Participating and nonparticipating respondents from all groups frequently identified the "percent of state contribution" as a factor. Concern about "future costs in the Excellence in Education Act" and about "continued funding" were important factors for many superintendents and board presidents of nonparticipating districts. Pedagogical issues commonly selected by respondents as reasons for participation included "encourage excellence in education," "recognize teachers," and "enhance student learning." Teacher "support of" or "resistance to" the concept of career ladders were important factors. Follow-up interviews supported the written survey responses and provided additional insight. As one superintendent remarked, "Teachers needed the opportunity (to increase salaries), so why not?" Several interviewees said key educational leaders cautioned them to go slowly and they received adequate information too late to take action for this year. Others wanted to see the plan in action first or wanted more research before participating.

Funding for the Career Ladder Program is on a shared state/local basis with a variable matching formula depending on school district wealth. The matching formula was an important factor in the decision to participate in the

program. Eight percent of the superintendents in nonparticipating districts indicated that they proposed a tax levy increase. Five percent said their voters rejected a tax levy that would have enabled them to implement career ladders. (Table 6) Had those levies passed, as many as twenty-four more school systems would have implemented career ladder plans during the 1986-87 school year. Of the 66 participating districts, 26% proposed a tax levy increase for the purpose of career ladders. The number of those districts passing levies was not ascertained by this study.

Proponents and opponents of incentive pay plans have agreed that incentives must be adequate or teachers will not participate. The Missouri General Assembly mandated the dollar amounts attached to each of the three stages of a career ladder. Respondents were asked if the salary supplements allowed by the Excellence in Education Act for successfully participating in a district career ladder plan are inadequate compensation for the additional work requirements. Twenty-seven percent of the superintendents in participating districts and 26% in nonparticipating districts thought the compensation to be inadequate. On the other hand, 51% of the teachers in participating districts and 54% in nonparticipating districts believed the compensation to be inadequate.

IV. ATTITUDES ABOUT CAREER LADDERS

This section is a presentation of the perceptions of teachers, principals, superintendents and board presidents about the concept of career ladders and the future impact of career ladders on Missouri education.

A. Attitudes and Perceptions

Table 7 provides data about various career ladder issues obtained through a series of attitudinal questions using a Likert-type response of 1 for strongly disagree, 2 for disagree, 3 for indifferent, 4 for agree, 5 for strongly agree. The open ended stem preceding all but the last fourteen statements in the table was "A district career ladder plan will tend to:". Though the issues are too numerous to address individually, general trends and specific issues will be discussed in the following paragraphs. Responses for all issues are presented in Table 7 so issues of interest not discussed can be analyzed by the reader. Asterisks note those pairings which are significantly different between participating and nonparticipating groups. For example: responses of teachers in participating and nonparticipating districts on the issue of "career ladders tend to be too complicated"

Table 7
Career Ladder Attitudes
Two-Way ANOVA-GLM Model
Least Squares Means
N = 1699

		Board		Principal		Superintendent		Teacher	
VARIABLE:	n	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P
Be too complicated	1677	3.1	2.7	3.2	2.3*	3.0	2.0*	3.4	2.8*
Be too political	1678	3.3	2.5*	3.8	2.4*	3.5	2.3*	4.1	3.4*
Foster individual effort	1680	3.7	3.8	3.7	4.1*	3.7	4.1*	3.4	3.8
Recognize team effort	1682	2.8	3.0	2.7	3.3*	2.6	3.5*	2.4*	3.0
Cause teachers to remain in the classroom	1672	3.1	3.2	3.0	3.2*	3.1	3.3	2.6	2.6
Encourage teachers to leave the classroom	1678	2.3	2.0	2.5	11.9*	2.2	1.6*	2.9	2.5*
Cause students and parents to request only CL teachers	1678	3.2	2.4*	3.4	2.6*	3.2	2.2*	3.1	2.4*

Table 7 (continued)

Career Ladder Attitudes

Two-Way ANOVA-GLM Model
Least Squares Means
N = 1699

		Board		Principal		Superintendent		Teacher	
VARIABLE:	n	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P
Including only teachers is appropriate	1675	3.3	3.4	2.7	2.7	3.3	3.3	3.1	3.4*
Individual choice to participate is appropriate	1683	3.9	4.4*	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.4	4.1	4.4*
CLP basically reward system for superior teaching	1675	3.3	3.1	3.1	3.1	2.9	3.2	2.6	2.5
There is apathy about participation	1669	3.4	2.2*	3.7	2.4*	3.5	1.8*	3.7	2.8*
CLP Guidelines for teachers should identify what is expected of tchrs	754	2.6	2.8	4.4	4.6	2.9	3.2*		
MO should establish a CLP for Admin.	754	4.3	4.6	3.4	3.9*	4.4	4.6		
Parents should be included in development and implementation	753	3.1	3.2	2.7	3.0	3.5	3.7		
Non-participating teachers will not be penalized	1663	4.2	4.6	4.2	4.7*	4.4	4.7*	3.2	4.0*
A dist. should part. to enhance instruction, improve. curr. and student learning	1674	3.2	3.9*	3.1	3.9*	3.2	4.1*	2.9	3.4*

Table 7 (continued)

Career Ladder Attitudes

Two-Way ANOVA-GLM Model
Least Squares Means
N = 1699

		Board		Principal		Superintendent		Teacher	
VARIABLE:	n	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P
Cause money and status to become more important than teaching itself	1680	3.0	2.5	2.9	2.3*	2.9	1.9*	3.4	2.9*
Cause teachers to spend more time on administrative tasks and less time on teaching	1684	3.1	2.5*	3.0	2.4*	3.0	2.2*	3.8	3.6*
Increase student learning	1681	3.1	3.3	3.1	3.5*	3.0	3.8*	2.7	2.9*
Increase professionalism among teachers	1683	3.4	3.8	3.1	3.6*	2.9	3.9*	2.8	3.2*
Focus on classroom teaching	1677	3.1	3.2	3.1	3.2	3.0	3.5*	2.6	2.5
Cause non-participants to be thought of as less effective	1678	3.6	3.0*	3.7	2.7*	3.7	2.5*	3.8	3.1*
Lower teacher and student morale	1678	2.7	2.1*	3.0	2.1*	2.9	1.6*	3.3	2.7*
Encourage quality teacher applicants	1681	3.3	3.5	3.0	3.4*	3.0	3.5*	2.9	3.0
Decrease cooperation among teachers with administrators	754	2.9	2.1*	3.0	2.3*	2.8	2.0*		

Table 7 (continued)

Career Ladder Attitudes

Two-Way ANOVA-GLM Model
Least Squares Means
N = 1699

		Board		Principal		Superintendent		Teacher	
VARIABLE:	n	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P
Define what it means to be a good teacher	1677	2.9	2.8	3.1	2.8	3.1	3.2	2.5	2.4
Create a quota system	1669	3.3	2.5*	3.5	2.4*	3.2	1.9*	3.6	3.2*
Discourage beginning teachers	1677	2.6	2.4	2.8	2.3*	2.5	1.7*	3.0	2.9*
Increase competition among teachers	1679	3.7	3.4	3.6	2.8*	3.7	2.6*	4.1	3.3*
Increase respect for teachers	1677	3.1	3.4	2.8	3.3*	2.9	3.8*	2.6	2.8*
Discourage sharing of material and ideas among teachers	1685	3.1	2.3*	3.2	2.1*	3.1	1.9*	3.6	2.7*
Cause teachers to be less cooperative with each other	1684	3.0	2.0*	3.4	2.1*	3.1	1.8*	3.7	2.7*
Recognize excellence in teaching	1685	3.7	3.3	3.2	3.6*	3.4	3.8*	2.8	2.9*
Create a climate adverse to student learning	1681	2.3	1.9	2.6	1.7*	2.4	1.6*	2.9	2.3*
Encourage excellent teachers to remain in the school system	1684	3.6	3.9	3.5	3.7	3.4	4.0*	3.0	3.0

Table 7 (continued)

Career Ladder Attitudes

Two-Way ANOVA-GLM Model
Least Squares Means
N = 1699

		Board		Principal		Superintendent		Teacher	
VARIABLE:	n	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P
Because DCLP promotes growth, teachers should particip.	1674	3.4	3.7	3.2	3.5	3.3	3.6*	2.8	3.2*
"Over the next five years, District Career Ladder Plans will help retain high quality teachers in Missouri"	1679	3.2	3.5	2.9	3.6*	3.0	3.9*	2.5	2.9*
"Over the next five years, District Career Ladder Plans will help improve the quality of instruction for students in Missouri"	1675	3.1	3.8*	3.0	3.7*	3.0	3.9*	2.6	2.9*
"Over the next five years, District Career Ladder Plans will help improve teacher professionalism in Missouri"	1670	3.2	3.6	3.0	3.7*	3.0	3.8*	2.7	3.0*
"Over the next five years, District Career Ladder Plans will help improve student achievement in Missouri"	1668	3.0	3.5	2.0	3.5*	2.9	3.8*	2.5	2.8*

(Note: * = significant differences at the .05 level)

differ significantly. Teachers in nonparticipating districts believe the issues are more complicated than do teachers in participating districts.

A review of all data in the table indicates teachers, principals and superintendents in career ladder districts are significantly more positive about most issues than comparable groups in non-career ladder districts. Among the certificated personnel, teachers tended to be the least positive (lowest mean scores on the five point scale) and superintendents tended to be the most positive toward the variety of issues queried.

Another general trend among the attitudes was the lack of significant differences between participating and nonparticipating board presidents. Though presidents of participating districts tended to be more positive, the differences were not statistically significant as often as for the other groups.

B. Performance Based Evaluation

A linkage between performance evaluation and career ladders is mandated by the career ladder legislation. To meet career ladder guidelines, districts must utilize performance based teacher evaluation and demonstrate that the criteria in the evaluation process are used as a basis for determining the effectiveness of teachers on the career ladder plan.

A survey question and a follow-up interview question addressed the performance evaluation issue. Using a one to five Likert-type scale of 1 for very inappropriate, 2 for inappropriate, 3 for indifferent, 4 for appropriate, and 5 for very appropriate, respondents were asked: "What is your opinion about the appropriateness of Performance Based Teacher Evaluation being a required part of the Career Ladder Model?" The majority of respondents from each group who shared an opinion believed a linkage between performance evaluation and career ladders was appropriate. Board presidents were more positive, with 92% of those representing participating districts and 81% representing nonparticipating districts indicating appropriateness of the concept. Superintendents were also highly supportive, with 88% from participating and 78% from nonparticipating districts supporting the linkage. Principals and teachers

were less supportive of the issue. For principals, 78% and 62% from participating and nonparticipating districts, respectively, supported the issue. Teachers were the least supportive; 58% from participating districts and 48% from nonparticipating districts, with 13% and 16% indifferent.

In the follow-up interviews, the participating superintendents were asked if they believed a career ladder plan would have a positive or a negative impact upon a performance evaluation program. For the participating group, the most typical response was that it will have a "positive" impact. The typical reason was "Teachers were involved in the planning and implementation and it was understood to be a reinforcement for improvement." The majority of responses from superintendents of nonparticipating districts indicated "not sure" and several replied "pressure on administrators/evaluators." Two typical comments expressed the nonparticipants' feelings: "forces decision on administrator," and "creates bad feelings between teachers and administrators."

C. Perceived Motivators for Participation

Eighty-five percent of the teachers from participating districts indicated they are participating or plan to participate in the career ladder program. Sixty-nine percent of the teachers from participating districts said they had a positive attitude about advancement on the career ladder plan. Participating and nonparticipating principals, superintendents and board presidents were asked to identify the factors which they believe motivate teachers to participate in a career ladder plan. Teachers participating in a career ladder plan described those factors which motivated them to participate during the 1986-87 year. Nonparticipating teachers were asked to identify those factors which would motivate them to participate. Table 8 summarizes the responses of all groups.

All respondents identified "additional compensation" as the most significant motivator for teacher participation in career ladders. However, the percentage of such responses from teachers was noticeably less than the percentage from principals, board presidents and superintendents. The non-monetary reasons of "challenge," "recognition," "goal setting," and "student achievement," were distant selections behind the "additional monetary compensation." In this

Table 8

Teacher Motivation for Participation in a DCLP Responses in Percentages

	Teacher		Principal		Board		Superintendent	
	N = 934		N = 231		N = 166		N = 368	
Variable	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P
Challenge	27	29	37	19	40	42	28	25
Greater Responsibility	8	7	13	13	5	15	15	16
Opportunity to participate in district level activities	6	9	12	9	6	12	14	20
Recognition	23	20	52	46	59	42	56	45
Additional compensation	64	79	88	100	92	100	92	98
Self-evaluation of performance	16	13	18	13	14	8	12	8
Setting own goals	27	29	21	36	26	38	23	29
Student achievement	25	21	22	25	24	23	16	39

situation, clearly the respondents believed money to be a motivator.

V. DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

This section of the report provides and analyzes data gathered directly from the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education annual report forms for all school districts. These data are of particular importance because they represent factual, as contrasted to attitudinal, data about the school systems in each group. The specific data analyzed and presented in Table 9 were selected based on the assumption of a potential relationship of the data to the decision to participate or not participate in the Career Ladder Program. The data for participating and nonparticipating districts were tested for significant differences. An asterisk is used to note the variables which were significantly different between participating and nonparticipating districts. The data reflect the most current records on computer file as of September, 1986. They are for the school year 1984-85.

The sixty-six participating school systems are significantly different from the remaining Missouri school districts on all but two of the variables selected for analysis. On each financial issue, the nonparticipating

Table 9

Demographic Data
Selected Variables
Tested for Differences by P/NP Groups
Using Parametric and Non-Parametric
Tests for Differences

VARIABLE		Non-Participating #	Non-Participating Means	Participating #	Participating Means	All Districts #	All Districts Means
Per Pupil Expenditure	*	477	$2562	66	$2356	543	$2537
Local Percent of Total Budget	*	477	30	66	19	543	29
Proposition C Percent of Total Budget	*	477	17	66	18	543	17
State Percent of Total Budget	*	477	48	66	57	543	49
Federal Percent of Total Budget	*	477	5	66	6	543	5
Number of Teachers		477	109	66	66	543	104
Number of Teachers with Masters & above		477	53	66	26	543	49
Average Teacher Salary	*	477	17652	66	16035	543	17455
Average Years Teacher Experience	*	477	13	66	12	543	13
Total Enrollment	*	477	1544	66	943	543	1471
Assessed Valuation	*	477	752582	66	197219	543	685079
Levy	*	476	2.34	66	1.91	542	2.29

*Note: Asterisk (*) indicates significant difference between participating and non-participating groups.

districts were significantly different. The nonparticipating districts spent more per student; provided more local support and received less from Proposition C (the one cent sales tax for education), from the state and from the federal government; had higher teacher salaries; had higher assessed valuations; and had a higher tax levy than participating districts.

On issues related to size, the nonparticipating schools had more students, more teachers, more teachers with more years experience and more teachers with graduate degrees than the participating districts. The differences on each of the issues except "number of teachers" and "number of teachers with Masters' degrees and above" were statistically significant. In essence the districts participating in the career ladder program are generally smaller and less wealthy than the other school systems of the state.

Another way to observe the correlation of lower wealth and smaller size with participation in the career ladder plan is to note the way in which participating districts fit into the funding formula brackets. Table 10 shows that most of the participating districts are those whose low adjusted equalized assessed valuation gives them high state support for the career ladder salary supplements. Indeed, almost a third of the 66 participating districts (19) qualify for the

Table 10

Distribution of Districts by
Funding Brackets

State/Local Funds	66 Participating Districts	479 NonParticipating Districts	All 545 Districts*
90%/10%	19	26	45
85%/15%	11	34	45
80%/20%	8	37	45
75%/25%	6	39	45
70%/30%	6	39	45
65%/35%	5	40	45
60%/40%	3	42	45
55%/45%	3	42	45
50%/50%	2	43	45
45%/55%	2	43	45
40%/60%	0	45	45
35%/65%	1	44	45

* Numbers rounded for distribution purposes

highest state match (90%) and almost half (30) come from the two highest match rates (90% and 85%).

VI. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Itemized below are the findings of this study which the researchers consider most worthy to highlight.

1. The primary source of information about career ladders to the school systems of Missouri was the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. Superintendents obtained most of the information from this source, then served as a primary resource for information to their personnel, particularly principals and board presidents. Principals and colleagues were the primary sources of information about career ladders to teachers.
2. The source which most influenced opinions of teachers, principals and superintendents about career ladders across the state was the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. Board presidents indicated they are most influenced by superintendents.
3. Most districts participating in career ladder programs during the 1986-87 school year used

committees of teachers, administrators and others to study the career ladder issue and recommend adoption to the board of education. A significant number of nonparticipating districts also used committees to study the concept and make recommendations to the board. Nonparticipation decisions were also frequently made by superintendents and/or board members without input from other personnel or constituents.

4. Many respondents indicated their districts did not have adequate time to address the career ladder issue for the 1986-87 school year. Responses representing over 200 districts indicated they are currently studying the issue. Based upon superintendents' projections, about 110 of those districts will recommend to their boards of education that a plan be adopted next year. Based upon data from this study, the number would be expected to diminish by at least 5% due to defeat of tax levy increases.

5. The career ladder plans in place in school systems across the state resemble the Career Ladder Model developed by the Department's Career Ladder Committee and disseminated in the Career Ladder Manual. When differences were described, the

changes were most typically in the qualifications and responsibilities for Stages II and III.

6. Finance appeared to be the overriding reason why districts chose to participate and not participate in the career ladder plan. Participating districts noted the supplement to teacher salaries as particularly important. Participating districts were significantly different from nonparticipating districts on each of the "wealth" related issues studied. Participating districts were mainly districts which received a higher percentage of variable-matching funds from the state. Nonparticipating district personnel noted "low state contribution" on the variable-matching monies as a major reason why their district did not participate. A few districts did not participate because tax levies failed to pass.
7. Few pedagogical or attitudinal issues surfaced as critical factors for participation or nonparticipation. The most notable attitudinal issue was "teacher support" or "resistance" to the concept. The most significant pedagogical issues were "encourage excellence in education," "enhance student learning," and "recognize good teachers."

8. General attitudes about career ladders and the impact of career ladders upon Missouri were clearly more positive among personnel from districts implementing career ladder plans than from districts without a career ladder. Among all respondents, superintendents were the most positive and teachers the least positive.
9. Though not overwhelming, there is evidence of a belief in the positive impact of career ladders across the state over the next five years. The general belief was that career ladders will improve the quality of instruction, teacher professionalism and student achievement. Superintendents were the most positive about this impact, teachers the least. Persons in career ladder districts were more positive than those in non-career ladder districts.
10. Most respondents believed a career ladder program should be adopted for administrators. Principals were the least supportive of this issue.
11. Respondents, particularly respondents from participating districts, believed school systems should participate in career ladder programs to enhance instruction, improve curriculum development and increase student achievement.

12. Administrators, particularly superintendents, believe career ladder plans will aid in retaining high quality teachers for the classrooms of Missouri schools.
13. Most respondents supported the linkage between career ladders and performance based teacher evaluation.
14. Money was shown to be perceived as a motivator of teachers by this study.
15. The 66 participating districts studied were significantly different from the nonparticipating districts in Missouri on key issues associated with district size and wealth.

VII. CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

Procedures used to decide whether to implement or not implement career ladders were generally in accordance with state regulations for career ladder approval suggesting faculty, administrator and community development and supervision. The participative management model was also used by many districts that eventually decided not to implement career ladder programs. Experiences with structured input and involvement through committees of teachers, principals, central office administrators and community members may have "carry-over" effects to other important district issues.

The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education played a critical role in the development and implementation of career ladder plans in participating districts. Department personnel and publications were the primary source of information and influence upon educators throughout the state regarding career ladder issues. The sources were generally viewed as supportive and positive in nature. Though some mention was made, particularly in follow-up interviews, that educational leaders suggested caution about involvement during the first year, the impact of those suggestions appear to have been overshadowed by fiscal considerations.

Many respondents indicated their district did not have adequate time to address the career ladder issues during the 1986-87 school year. This is to be expected. Participative management of significant change in an organization takes time to study, develop, nurture and implement. Many districts, particularly larger districts, may not have had the time to adequately study the issue and approve tax levies before the application deadlines for the 1986-87 year. Data from this study indicated that as many as 105 districts will implement programs during the 1987-88 school year. Excluding significant changes in attitude among leaders and difficulties at the polls, many new districts will implement career ladder programs next year. Based upon data from this study, it is estimated that 170 districts will have career ladder programs by next fall, approximately one in every three districts.

Most respondents believed career ladders will have a positive impact on Missouri education. Persons associated with career ladder programs were significantly more positive about that impact. The majority of currently participating school systems are smaller and less wealthy than most school systems in the state. The career ladder program is providing a source of income to those districts that is worth the time and energy invested. Over a longer term, those districts expect to observe benefits other than salary

through the retention of quality teachers and the instructional and curricular impacts associated with responsibilities for each Career Stage. For those and many other districts yet to apply, the career ladder program is a positive educational venture. With over 200 districts studying the issue this year, the Missouri Career Ladder program appears to be at a crossroads.

The data from this study indicate that districts chose to implement career ladder programs for monetary, rather than pedagogical reasons. The data also indicate that most respondents view the monetary rewards from career ladders as a primary motivator for participation. This focus on finance is a commentary on the salary structures in education and raises the issue of adequate financing of education.

Educators expressed to the researchers concern that the political fortunes of key legislators could lead to withering funding for career ladders. Though no funding category is sacred, a commitment by legislators to continue funding of the career ladder plan for a specified number of years might encourage participation. On the other hand, if basic educational funding suffers because monies are placed in a career ladder category rather than in the state foundation formula which supplies basic salary monies, career ladders will become nothing more than a salary

supplement and move Missouri education further from the use of career ladders as an incentive in the most professional sense. Ideally, an incentive plan should motivate personnel through the use of intrinsic satisfiers, not through basic, survival satisfiers. At present, career ladders are meeting a need across the state, a monetary need for most. At some time in the future, perhaps the Missouri Career Ladder Program can meet a higher order need for all.

A P P E N D I C E S

Missouri Statutes
168.500 - 168.520

Section 168.500. 1. For the purpose of providing career pay, which shall be a salary supplement, for public school teachers, which for the purpose of section 168.500 through 168.515 of this act shall include classroom teachers, librarians and guidance counselors, there is hereby created and established a career advancement program which shall be known as the "Missouri Career Development and Teacher Excellence Plan", hereinafter known as the "career plan or program", and shall become effective upon the adoption by the department of elementary and secondary education of rules and regulations for the implementation of sections 168.500 through 168.515 of this act; but in no case shall this career plan become effective later than September 1, 1986. Participation by local school districts in the career advancement program established under this section shall be voluntary. The career advancement program is a matching fund program of variable match rates. The general assembly shall make an annual appropriation to the excellence in education fund established under section 7 of this act for the purpose of providing the state's portion for the career advancement program.

2. The department of elementary and secondary education, at the direction of the commissioner of education, shall study and develop model career plans which shall be made available to the local school districts. These state model career plans shall:

(1) Contain three steps or stages of career advancement;

(2) Contain a detailed procedure for the admission of teachers to the career program;

(3) Contain specific criteria for career step qualifications and attainment, which criteria shall clearly describe the professional responsibilities expected of the teacher at each stage of the plan and shall include reference to classroom performance evaluations performed pursuant to section 168.128, RSMo;

(4) Be consistent with the teacher certification process recommended by the Missouri advisory council of certification for educators and adopted by the department of elementary and secondary education;

(5) Provide that public school teachers in Missouri shall become eligible to apply for admission to the career plans adopted under sections 168.500 through 168.515 of this act, after five years of public school teaching in Missouri. All teachers seeking admission to any career plan shall, as a minimum, meet the requirements necessary to obtain the first renewable professional certificate as provided in section 168.021, RSMo;

(6) Provide procedures for appealing decisions made under career plans established under sections 168.500 through 168.515 of this act.

3. The commissioner of education shall cause the department of elementary and secondary education to establish guidelines for all career plans established under this section, and criteria that must be met by any school district which seeks funding for its career plan.

4. A participating local school district may have the option of implementing a career plan developed by the department of elementary and secondary education or a local plan which has been developed with advice from teachers employed by the district and which has met with the approval of the department of elementary and secondary education. In approving local career plans, the department of elementary and secondary education may consider provisions in the plan of the local district for recognition of teacher mobility from one district to another within this state.

5. The career plans of local school districts shall not discriminate on the basis of race, sex, religion, national origin, color, creed, or age. Participation in the career plan of a local school district is optional, and any teacher who declines to participate shall not be penalized in any way.

6. In order to receive funds under this section, a school district must have a total levy for operating purposes which is in excess of the amount allowed in section 11(b) of article X of the Missouri Constitution.

168.505. 1. Any teacher receiving career pay under any plan or program established under sections 168.500 through 168.515 of this act, shall continue to receive the district base pay to which he would be entitled if he were not receiving the career pay provided for in sections 168.500 through 168.515 of this act.

2. Any teacher receiving career pay under any plan or program established under sections 168.500 through 168.515 of this act, shall receive any local pay to which teachers with similar training and experience are otherwise entitled.

168.510. After a teacher who is duly employed by a district qualifies and is selected for participation under a career plan established under sections 168.500 through 168.515 of this act, such teacher shall not be denied the career pay authorized by such plan unless he:

(1) Is dismissed for cause as established under section 168.114, RSMo; or

(2) Fails to maintain or renew any certificate required by the department of elementary and secondary education; or

(3) Fails to maintain the performance level as required for the attainment of the career stage as set forth in the plan effective in the local district as provided in section 168.500 of this act; and

(4) Has exhausted all due process procedures provided by subdivision (6) of subsection 2 of section 168.500 of this act.

168.515. 1. Each teacher selected to participate in a career plan established under sections 168.500 through 168.515 of this act, who meets the requirements of such plan, shall receive a salary supplement, the state's share of which shall be provided through the excellence in education fund established under section 7 of this act, as follows:

(1) Career stage I teachers may receive up to an additional one thousand five hundred dollars per school year;

(2) Career stage II teachers may receive up to an additional three thousand dollars per school year.

(3) Career stage III teachers may receive up to an additional five thousand dollars per school year;

2. The state shall make payments directly to the local school district for the purpose of reimbursing the local school district for the payment of any salary supplements provided for in this section subject to the availability of funds as appropriated each year and distributed on a variable match formula which shall include a bonus provision and shall be determined by a district's equalized assessed valuation multiplied by the district income factor established in section 163.031, RSMo, and which shall be known as the adjusted equalized assessed valuation.

3. In distributing these matching funds, school districts shall be ranked by the adjusted equalized assessed valuation from the lowest to the highest into groups, each of which shall contain one-twelfth of the public school districts. Pursuant to subsection 4, districts in the lowest group shall receive ninety percent state funding and shall contribute ten percent local funding. State and local funding portion shall decrease and increase respectively by incremental brackets of five percentage points pursuant to subsection 4. Districts in the highest group shall receive thirty-five percent state funding and shall contribute sixty-five percent local funding.

4. The incremental brackets of five percent are as follows:

State Funds	Local Funds
90%	10%
85%	15%
80%	20%
75%	25%
70%	30%
65%	35%
60%	40%
55%	45%
50%	50%
45%	55%
40%	60%
35%	65%

5. Any district in any bracket between the eighty-five percent state funding and fifteen percent local funding level and the thirty-five percent state funding and sixty-five percent local funding level shall be entitled to a bonus equal to five percent state funding under this section if such district has increased its levy after the effective date of this section by no less than the amount necessary to pay the total local share of participation in the career plan.

6. Each school district shall inform the commissioner of education of the number of duly qualified teachers in the district who are entitled to a state-paid salary supplement under this section. The commissioner of education shall, in accordance with chapter 33, RSMo, execute payment to the districts.

7. Not less than every fourth year, beginning with calendar year 1988, the general assembly, through the joint committee established under section 3 of this act, shall review the amount of the career pay provided for in this section to determine if any increases are necessary to reflect the increases in the cost of living which have occurred since the salary supplements were last reviewed or set.

8. To participate in the salary supplement program established under this section, a school district may submit to the voters of the district a proposition to increase taxes for this purpose. If a school district's current tax rate ceiling is at or above the rate from which an increase would require a two-thirds majority, the school board may submit to the voters of the district a proposition to reduce or eliminate the amount of the levy reduction resulting from section 164.013, RSMo. If a majority of the voters voting thereon vote in favor of the proposition, the board may certify that seventy-five percent of the revenue generated from this source shall be used to implement the salary supplement program established under this section.

9. In no case shall a local school district use as its matching funds to participate in this career program, any state aid provided pursuant to section 163.031 RSMO, or sections 6 or 163.171 of this act.

168.520. 1. For the purpose of providing career pay, which shall be a salary supplement for teachers, librarians and guidance counselors in the state schools for the severely handicapped, the Missouri school for the blind and the Missouri school for the deaf, there is hereby established a career advancement program which shall become effective no later than September 1, 1986. Participation in the career advancement program by teachers shall be voluntary.

2. The department of elementary and secondary education with the recommendation of teachers from the state schools, shall develop a career plan. This state career plan shall include, but need not be limited to, the provisions of state model career plans as contained in subsection 2 of section 168.500 of this act.

3. After a teacher who is duly employed by a state school qualifies and is selected for participation in the state career plan established under this section, such a teacher shall not be denied the career pay authorized by such plan except as provided in subdivisions (1), (2), and (3) of section 168.510 of this act.

4. Each teacher selected to participate in the career plan established under this section who meets the requirements of such plan, shall receive a salary supplement as provided in subdivisions (1), (2), and (3) of subsection 1 of section 168.515 of this act.

5. The department of elementary and secondary education shall annually include within its budget request to the general assembly sufficient funds for the purpose of providing career pay as established under this section to those eligible teachers employed in state schools for the severely handicapped, the Missouri school for the deaf, and the Missouri school for the blind.

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-COLUMBIA

College of Education

Office of the Dean

109 114 Hill Hall
Columbia MO 65211-0211
Telephone (314) 882-8311

October 3, 1986

Dear Teacher:

Career Ladders is a new concept in Missouri. When the Missouri State Legislature passed the "career ladder" legislation in the spring of 1985, there were expectations that a large percentage of school districts in Missouri would choose to participate in the program. This has not been the case during 1986-87, with less than seventy districts being involved. To understand why some districts did, or did not, participate and to understand the attitudes of teachers, principals, superintendents and school board members regarding career ladders is critical information for legislators and educators as they explore future directions. The purpose of the enclosed survey is to identify those reasons and attitudes.

This study is a joint effort between the Missouri House of Representatives and the University of Missouri-Columbia, College of Education, Office of Research and Development, with funding from the National Conference of State Legislatures' Committee on Education and Labor. It is anticipated that the results of this study will reach beyond Missouri to also benefit other states that are studying the issues of career ladders and teacher incentive programs.

We know that to ask you to take 20-30 minutes to complete a survey is an imposition on your time; yet, your responses are essential. We would appreciate your responding to the items and then returning the survey in the enclosed envelope. Your perceptions will, of course, be anonymous. We need and value your thoughts.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Richard C. Schofer
Project Director

Jeanette C. Murphy
Research Associate

Jerry Valentine
Project Coordinator

THE MISSOURI CAREER LADDER IMPLEMENTATION SURVEY
TEACHER FORM P

PURPOSE OF THE SURVEY IS TO IDENTIFY THE REASONS FOR DISTRICT PARTICIPATION OR NONPARTICIPATION IN THE CAREER LADDER PROGRAM AS SET FORTH IN MISSOURI LAW WITHIN THE EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION ACT OF 1985.

TO ASSIST YOU WITH YOUR RESPONSES TO THIS SURVEY, A BRIEF OUTLINE OF THE MISSOURI CAREER LADDER PLAN MODEL AS WELL AS A COPY OF THE ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR CAREER LADDER TEACHERS ARE ATTACHED.

PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER OF THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE.

1. Teaching level: (1) Elementary School
(2) Junior High/Middle School
(3) Secondary School

2. Subject Area(s): _____

3. Degree(s): (1) Bachelor
(2) Master
(3) Master's Plus
(4) Specialist
(5) Doctorate

4. Sex: (1) Male
(2) Female

5. Age: (1) 23 or under
(2) 24-29
(3) 30-34
(4) 35-39
(5) 40-44
(6) 45-49
(7) 50-54
(8) 55-59
(9) 60 or older

6. Years taught (include current): (1) 5 or less
(2) 6-10 years
(3) 11-15 years
(4) 16 or more

7. Years taught in this school (include current): (1) 5 years or less
(2) 6-10 years
(3) 11-15 years
(4) 16 years or more

8. Do you have tenure: (1) Yes
(2) No

9. Classification of district in which you teach:
(1) Metropolitan (St. Louis City)
(2) Urban (Kansas City, Springfield, Independence, St. Joseph)
(3) Six-director: Jackson or St. Louis counties
(4) Six-director: containing a city of 25,000 to 70,000
(5) Six-director: containing a city of 5,000 to 24,999
(6) Six-director: containing a city of less than 5,000
(7) Special school district

10. Salary level:
(1) less than $16,000
(2) $16,000-19,999
(3) $20,000-24,999
(4) 25,000-29,999
(5) $30,000 or more

Appendix B

11. WHEN YOU FIRST BECAME AWARE THAT THE STATE OF MISSOURI WAS CONSIDERING A CAREER DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR TEACHERS AS STATE POLICY (SUBSEQUENTLY THE CAREER LADDER PLAN), WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING WAS THE SOURCE OF YOUR INFORMATION. (Please circle the number of as many responses as are appropriate.)

1. informal discussion with other teachers
2. newspaper
3. television
4. radio
5. professional magazines
6. professional organization meetings
7. supervisors, i.e., Principal, Superintendent
8. legislative meetings
9. legislative communiques
10. Department of Elementary and Secondary Education bulletins
11. Department of Elementary and Secondary Education workshops
12. other (indicate) _____

_____

For questions 12-14, please circle the most appropriate response.

12. INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH PUBLICITY FROM OTHER DISTRICTS OR STATES INFLUENCED YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT CAREER LADDER PLANS.

1	2	3	4	5
highly negative influence	somewhat negative influence	no influence	somewhat positive influence	highly positive influence

13. INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION INFLUENCED YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT CAREER LADDER PLANS.

1	2	3	4	5
highly negative influence	somewhat negative influence	no influence	somewhat positive influence	highly positive influence

14. IN WHAT WAY WAS THE CAREER LADDER PLAN FORMALLY INTRODUCED TO YOU IN YOUR DISTRICT?

1. presented at a state sponsored workshop
2. presented through a district workshop
3. has not been formally presented to me
4. other (indicate) _____

15. YOUR DISTRICT HAS DECIDED TO IMPLEMENT A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING BEST DESCRIBES HOW IT WAS DEVELOPED? (Please circle the number of the most appropriate response.)

1. A district committee of teachers, principals, and central office administrators studied Career Ladder issues and models, developed a plan and made a recommendation to the board.

2. A district committee of principals and central office administrators studied Career Ladder issues and models, developed a plan and made a recommendation to the board.

3. A district committee of building administrators studied Career Ladder issues and models, developed a plan and made a recommendation to the board.

4. District administrators reviewed the state Career Ladder Plan Model and recommended that model to the board without formal committee input from teaching staff.

5. District Board of Education members reviewed the state Career Ladder Plan Model and adopted it for implementation without formal committee input from central administration or teaching staff.

6. Other (PLEASE EXPLAIN): _____

_____

_____

16. YOUR DISTRICT HAS ADOPTED A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN. IS IT: (See attachment for assistance with your answer. Please circle the number of the appropriate response.)

1. identical to the Missouri Career Ladder Plan Model
2. a modified version of the Missouri Career Ladder Plan Model
3. a district created plan not very similar to the Missouri Career Ladder Plan Model
4. other _____

_____

_____

_____

17. IN YOUR OPINION, THE REASONS WHY YOUR DISTRICT DID DEVELOP A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN INCLUDE: (Please circle the number of no more than 3 responses.)

1. because it is available
2. recognition of teachers
3. another way of getting extra dollars
4. encourage excellence in education
5. enhance student learning
6. percent of state contribution was a factor
7. political pressure
8. teachers in favor of participation
9. administrators in favor of participation
10. superintendent recommendation
11. to attract qualified teachers when vacancies occur
12. other (indicate) _____

18. I PLAN TO PARTICIPATE IN THE DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN.

(1) Yes (2) No

IF YOUR ANSWER IS NO, PLEASE GO TO ITEM 21.

19. DO YOU HAVE A POSITIVE ATTITUDE ABOUT ADVANCEMENT ON THE DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN?

(1) Yes (2) No

20. YOUR DISTRICT HAS A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN AND YOU ARE PLANNING TO PARTICIPATE. WHAT 3 REASONS BEST DESCRIBE YOUR MOTIVATION? (Please circle the appropriate numbers for your response.)

1. challenge
2. greater responsibility
3. opportunity to participate in district level activities
4. recognition
5. additional compensation
6. self-evaluation of performance
7. setting own goals
8. student achievement
9. other (indicate) _____

21. WHAT IS YOUR OPINION ABOUT THE APPROPRIATENESS OF THE PERFORMANCE BASED TEACHER EVALUATION BEING A REQUIRED PART OF THE CAREER LADDER MODEL? (Please circle the number of the most appropriate response.)

1	2	3	4	5
very inappropriate	inappropriate	indifferent	appropriate	very appropriate

22. WHO IS PRIMARILY RESPONSIBLE FOR TEACHER EVALUATIONS? (Please circle the number of as many responses as are appropriate)

1. Principal
2. Superintendent
3. Assistant Principal
4. Supervisor
5. Teacher Teams
6. Teacher/Administrator Team
7. other (indicate) _____

_____

USING THE FOLLOWING CODE, PLEASE RESPOND TO EACH STATEMENT BY PLACING IN THE BLANK THE NUMBER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS.

1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=indifferent, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree

A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN WILL TEND TO:

___23. increase competition among teachers.

___24. increase respect for teachers.

___25. be too complicated.

___26. be too political.

___27. foster individual effort.

___28. recognize team effort.

___29. discourage sharing of material and ideas among teachers.

___30. cause teachers to be less open and cooperative with each other.

___31. motivate only those who are already motivated.

___32. recognize excellence in teaching.

___33. create a climate adverse to student learning.

___34. cause teachers to remain in the classroom.

___35. encourage excellent teachers to remain in the system.

___36. cause money and status to become more important than teaching itself.

___37. encourage teachers to leave the classroom.

___38. cause teachers to spend more time on administrative tasks and less time on teaching.

USING THE FOLLOWING CODE, PLEASE RESPOND TO EACH STATEMENT BY PLACING IN THE BLANK THE NUMBER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS.

1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=indifferent, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree

A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN WILL TEND TO:

___39. increase student learning.

___40. increase professionalism among teachers.

___41. cause students and parents to request Career Ladder teachers rather than those who are not on the Ladder.

___42. focus on classroom teaching.

___43. cause nonparticipants to be thought of as less effective teachers.

___44. define what it means to be a good teacher.

___45. create a quota system relating to the number of teachers who can participate in each stage of the Plan.

___46. lower teacher and student morale.

___47. discourage beginning teachers because five years is too long to wait in order to participate.

___48. encourage quality teacher applicants to seek employment in the district.

USING THE FOLLOWING CODE, PLEASE RESPOND TO EACH STATEMENT BY PLACING IN THE BLANK THE NUMBER WHICH BEST DESCRIBED THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS.

1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=indifferent, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree

___49. Including only teachers, counselors and librarians for participation in the Career Ladder Plan is appropriate.

___50. The salary supplements allowed by the Excellence in Education Act of 1985 for successfully participating in a District Career Ladder Plan are inadequate compensation for the additional work requirements.

___51. Having an individual choice to participate or not participate in a District Career Ladder Plan is appropriate.

___52. The Career Ladder Plan is basically a reward system for superior teaching.

USING THE FOLLOWING CODE, PLEASE PLACE IN THE BLANK, THE NUMBER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS.

1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=indifferent, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree

___53. A district should participate in a District Career Ladder Plan because the plan should enhance instruction, improve curriculum development, and improve student learning in the district.

___54. Because a District Career Ladder Plan should be promoting professional growth, a teacher should participate.

___55. According to the wording of the Missouri law pertaining to Career Ladders, "any teacher who declines to participate shall not be penalized in any way." This will be honored in our district.

___56. There is apathy among my colleagues about participation in the District Career Ladder Plan.

___57. Over the next five years, District Career Ladder Plans will help retain high quality teachers in Missouri.

___58. Over the next five years, District Career Ladder Plans will help improve the quality of instruction for students in Missouri.

___59. Over the next five years, District Career Ladder Plans will help improve teacher professionalism in Missouri.

___60. Over the next five years, District Career Ladder Plans will help improve student achievement in Missouri.

61. THE PURPOSE OF THE CAREER LADDER PORTION OF THE EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION ACT OF 1985 WAS TO RETAIN HIGH QUALITY TEACHERS IN MISSOURI CLASSROOMS. IF YOU BELIEVE THERE ARE MORE APPROPRIATE WAYS TO ACHIEVE THIS GOAL, PLEASE DESCRIBE THEM BELOW.

THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO RESPOND TO THIS SURVEY.

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-COLUMBIA

College of Education

Office of the Dean

October 3, 1986

Dear Principal:

Career Ladders is a new concept in Missouri. When the Missouri State Legislature passed the "career ladder" legislation in the spring of 1985, there were expectations that a large percentage of school districts in Missouri would choose to participate in the program. This has not been the case during 1986-87, with less than seventy districts being involved. To understand why some districts did, or did not, participate and to understand the attitudes of teachers, principals, superintendents and school board members regarding career ladders is critical information for legislators and educators as they explore future directions. The purpose of the enclosed survey is to identify those reasons and attitudes.

This study is a joint effort between the Missouri House of Representatives and the University of Missouri-Columbia, College of Education, Office of Research and Development, with funding from the National Conference of State Legislatures' Committee on Education and Labor. It is anticipated that the results of this study will reach beyond Missouri to also benefit other states that are studying the issues of career ladders and teacher incentive programs.

We know that to ask you to take 20-30 minutes to complete a survey is an imposition on your time; yet, your responses are essential. We would appreciate your responding to the items and then returning the survey in the enclosed envelope. Your perceptions will, of course, be anonymous. We need and value your thoughts.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Richard C. Schofer
Project Director

Jeanette C. Murphy
Research Associate

Jerry Valentine
Project Coordinator

THE MISSOURI CAREER LADDER IMPLEMENTATION SURVEY
PRINCIPAL FORM P

PURPOSE OF THE SURVEY IS TO IDENTIFY THE REASONS FOR DISTRICT PARTICIPATION OR NONPARTICIPATION IN THE CAREER LADDER PROGRAM AS SET FORTH IN MISSOURI LAW WITHIN THE EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION ACT OF 1985.

TO ASSIST YOU WITH YOUR RESPONSES TO THIS SURVEY, A BRIEF OUTLINE OF THE MISSOURI CAREER LADDER PLAN MODEL AS WELL AS A COPY OF THE ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR CAREER LADDER TEACHERS ARE ATTACHED.

PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER OF THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE.

1. Administrative level: (1) Elementary School
(2) Junior High/Middle School
(3) Secondary School

2. Degree(s): (1) Bachelor
(2) Master
(3) Master's Plus
(4) Specialist
(5) Doctorate

3. Sex: (1) Male
(2) Female

4. Age: (1) 23 or under
(2) 24-29
(3) 30-34
(4) 35-39
(5) 40-44
(6) 45-49
(7) 50-54
(8) 55-59
(9) 60 or older

5. Years teaching experience: (1) 5 or less
(2) 6-10 years
(3) 11-15 years
(4) 16 or more

6. Years experience as a Principal: (1) 5 years or less
(2) 6-10 years
(3) 11-15 years
(4) 16 years or more

7. Years Principal in this school (include current year) (1) 5 years or less
(2) 6-10 years
(3) 11-15 years
(4) 16 years or more

8. Classification of district in which you are a Principal: (1) Metropolitan (St. Louis City)
(2) Urban (Kansas City, Springfield, Independence, St. Joseph)
(3) Six-director: Jackson or St. Louis counties
(4) Six-director: containing a city of 25,000 to 70,000
(5) Six-director: containing a city of 5,000 to 24,999
(6) Six-director: containing a city of less than 5,000
(7) Special school district

9. Salary level:
(1) less than $20,000
(2) $20,000-24,999
(3) 25,000-29,999
(4) $30,000-34,999
(5) $35,000-39,999
(6) $40,000 or more

10. Number of students enrolled in your district as of October 1, 1986:
(1) 300 or less
(2) 301-800
(3) 801-1500
(4) 1501-3000
(5) 3001-5000
(6) 5001-10000
(7) 10001-15000
(8) 15001 or more

11. Classification of your district:
(1) AAA
(2) AA
(3) A

12. WHEN YOU FIRST BECAME AWARE THAT THE STATE OF MISSOURI WAS CONSIDERING A CAREER DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR TEACHERS AS STATE POLICY (SUBSEQUENTLY THE CAREER LADDER PLAN), WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING WAS THE SOURCE OF YOUR INFORMATION. (Please circle the number of as many responses as are appropriate.)

1. informal discussion with other Principals
2. newspaper
3. television
4. radio
5. professional magazines
6. professional organization meetings
7. supervisors, i.e., Superintendent
8. legislative meetings
9. legislative communiques
10. Department of Elementary and Secondary Education bulletins
11. Department of Elementary and Secondary Education workshops
12. other (indicate) _____

For questions 13-16 please circle the number of the most appropriate response.

13. INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH PUBLICITY FROM OTHER DISTRICTS OR STATES INFLUENCED YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT CAREER LADDER PLANS.

1	2	3	4	5
highly negative influence	somewhat negative influence	no influence	somewhat positive influence	highly positive influence

14. INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION INFLUENCED YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT CAREER LADDER PLANS.

1	2	3	4	5
highly negative influence	somewhat negative influence	no influence	somewhat positive influence	highly positive influence

15. TO WHAT DEGREE WAS THE OPPORTUNITY TO SUPPLEMENT CURRENT TEACHER SALARIES AN IMPORTANT FACTOR LEADING TO THE DECISION TO IMPLEMENT A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN.

1	2	3	4	5
not important		somewhat important		highly important

16. IN WHAT WAY WAS THE CAREER LADDER PLAN FORMALLY INTRODUCED TO YOU IN YOUR DISTRICT?

1. presented at a state sponsored workshop
2. presented through a district workshop
3. has not been formally presented to me
4. other (indicate) _____

17. YOUR DISTRICT HAS DECIDED TO IMPLEMENT A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING BEST DESCRIBES HOW IT WAS DEVELOPED? (Please circle the number of the most appropriate response.)

1. A district committee of teachers, principals, and central office administrators studied Career Ladder issues and models, developed a plan and made a recommendation to the board.

2. A district committee of principals and central office administrators studied Career Ladder issues and models, developed a plan and made a recommendation to the board.

3. A district committee of building administrators studied Career Ladder issues and models, developed a plan and made a recommendation to the board.

4. District administrators reviewed the state Career Ladder Plan Model and recommended that model to the board without formal committee input from teaching staff.

5. District Board of Education members reviewed the state Career Ladder Plan Model and adopted it for implementation without formal committee input from central administration or teaching staff.

6. Other (PLEASE EXPLAIN): _____
_____
_____
_____

18. YOUR DISTRICT HAS ADOPTED A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN. IS IT: (See attachment for assistance with your answer. Please circle the number of the appropriate response.)

1. identical to the Missouri Career Ladder Plan Model
2. a modified version of the Missouri Career Ladder Plan Model
3. a district created plan not very similar to the Missouri Career Ladder Plan Model
4. other _____

_____

_____

_____

19. IN YOUR OPINION, THE REASONS WHY YOUR DISTRICT DID DEVELOP A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN INCLUDE: (Please circle the number of no more than 3 responses.)

1. because it is available
2. recognition of teachers
3. another way of getting extra dollars
4. encourage excellence in education
5. enhance student learning
6. percent of state contribution was a factor
7. political pressure
8. teachers in favor of participation
9. administrators in favor of participation
10. superintendent recommendation
11. to attract qualified teacher applicants
12. other (indicate) _____

20. HOW MANY TEACHERS ARE ASSIGNED TO YOUR BUILDING? _____

21. IN YOUR ESTIMATION, HOW MANY TEACHERS IN YOUR BUILDING WILL BE ELIGIBLE TO PARTICIPATE IN THE CAREER LADDER PLAN? _____

22. OF THOSE DESCRIBED IN ITEM 21, WHAT PERCENT DO YOU BELIEVE WILL APPLY FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN? _____%.

23. CIRCLE THE THREE (3) ITEMS ON THE FOLLOWING LIST WHICH YOU BELIEVE WILL MOST LIKELY MOTIVATE TEACHERS TO PARTICIPATE IN A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN.

1. challenge
2. greater responsibility
3. opportunity to participate in district level activities
4. recognition
5. additional compensation
6. self-evaluation of performance
7. setting own goals
8. student achievement
9. other (indicate) _____

24. WHAT IS YOUR OPINION ABOUT THE APPROPRIATENESS OF THE PERFORMANCE BASED TEACHER EVALUATION BEING A REQUIRED PART OF THE CAREER LADDER MODEL? (Please circle the number of the appropriate response.)

1	2	3	4	5
very inappropriate	inappropriate	indifferent	appropriate	very appropriate

25. WHO IS PRIMARILY RESPONSIBLE FOR TEACHER EVALUATIONS? (Please circle the number of as many responses as are appropriate)

1. Principal
2. Superintendent
3. Assistant Principal
4. Supervisor
5. Teacher Teams
6. Teacher/Administrator Team
7. Other (indicate) _____
_____

USING THE FOLLOWING CODE, PLEASE RESPOND TO EACH STATEMENT BY PLACING IN THE BLANK THE NUMBER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS.

1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=indifferent, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree

A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN WILL TEND TO:

___26. increase competition among teachers.

___27. increase respect for teachers.

___28. be too complicated.

___29. be too political.

___30. foster individual effort.

USING THE FOLLOWING CODE, PLEASE RESPOND TO EACH STATEMENT BY PLACING IN THE BLANK THE NUMBER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS.

1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=indifferent, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree

A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN WILL TEND TO:

___31. recognize team effort.

___32. discourage sharing of material and ideas among teachers.

___33. cause teachers to be less open and cooperative with each other.

___34. motivate only those who are already motivated.

___35. recognize excellence in teaching.

___36. create a climate adverse to student learning.

___37. cause teachers to remain in the classroom.

___38. encourage excellent teachers to remain in the system.

___39. cause money and status to become more important than teaching itself.

___40. encourage teachers to leave the classroom.

___41. cause teachers to spend more time on administrative tasks and less time on teaching.

___42. increase student learning.

___43. increase professionalism among teachers.

___44. cause students and parents to request Career Ladder teachers rather than those who are not on the Ladder.

___45. focus on classroom teaching.

___46. cause nonparticipants to be thought of as less effective teachers.

___47. define what it means to be a good teacher.

___48. create a quota system relating to the number of teachers who can participate in each stage of the Plan.

___49. lower teacher and student morale.

___50. discourage beginning teachers because five years is too long to wait in order to participate.

___51. encourage higher quality teacher applicants to seek employment in the district.

___52. decrease cooperativeness among teachers with administrators.

USING THE FOLLOWING CODE, PLEASE RESPOND TO EACH STATEMENT BY PLACING IN THE BLANK THE NUMBER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS.

1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=indifferent, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree

___53. Including only teachers, counselors and librarians for participation in the Career Ladder Plan is appropriate.

___54. The salary supplements allowed by the Excellence in Education Act of 1985 for successfully participating in a District Career Ladder Plan are inadequate compensation for the additional work requirements.

___55. A teacher having an individual choice to participate or not participate in a District Career Ladder Plan is appropriate.

___56. The Career Ladder Plan is basically a reward system for superior teaching.

___57. A district should participate in a District Career Ladder Plan because the plan should enhance instruction, improve curriculum development, and improve student learning in the district.

___58. Because a District Career Ladder Plan should be promoting professional growth, a teacher should participate.

___59. According to the wording of the Missouri law pertaining to Career Ladders, "any teacher who declines to participate shall not be penalized in any way." This will be honored in our district.

___60. There is apathy among my colleagues about participation in the District Career Ladder Plan.

___61. Career Ladder Plan guidelines should be drawn up so that teachers know what is expected of them.

___62. Provisions should be made for additional compensation for Administrators to recognize the increase in work and paper load.

___63. The State of Missouri should establish a Career Ladder Plan for Administrators.

___64. Parents should be included in the development and implementation of a District Career Ladder Plan.

USING THE FOLLOWING CODE, PLEASE PLACE IN THE BLANK, THE NUMBER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS.

1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=indifferent, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree

___65. Over the next five years, District Career Ladder Plans will help retain high quality teachers in Missouri.

___66. Over the next five years, District Career Ladder Plans will help improve the quality of instruction for students in Missouri.

___67. Over the next five years, District Career Ladder Plans will help improve teacher professionalism in Missouri.

___68. Over the next five years, District Career Ladder Plans will help improve student achievement in Missouri.

69. THE PURPOSE OF THE CAREER LADDER PORTION OF THE EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION ACT OF 1985 WAS TO RETAIN HIGH QUALITY TEACHERS IN MISSOURI CLASSROOMS. IF YOU BELIEVE THERE ARE MORE APPROPRIATE WAYS TO ACHIEVE THIS GOAL, PLEASE DESCRIBE THEM BELOW.

THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO RESPOND TO THIS SURVEY.

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-COLUMBIA

College of Education

Office of the Dean

[illegible]
Columbia, MO 65211 (573)
Telephone (314) 882-8311

October 3, 1986

Dear Superintendent

Career Ladders is a new concept in Missouri. When the Missouri State Legislature passed the "career ladder" legislation in the spring of 1985, there were expectations that a large percentage of school districts in Missouri would choose to participate in the program. This has not been the case during 1986-87, with less than seventy districts being involved. To understand why some districts did, or did not, participate and to understand the attitudes of teachers, principals, superintendents and school board members regarding career ladders is critical information for legislators and educators as they explore future directions. The purpose of the enclosed survey is to identify those reasons and attitudes.

This study is a joint effort between the Missouri House of Representatives and the University of Missouri-Columbia, College of Education, Office of Research and Development, with funding from the National Conference of State Legislatures' Committee on Education and Labor. It is anticipated that the results of this study will reach beyond Missouri to also benefit other states that are studying the issues of career ladders and teacher incentive programs.

We know that to ask you to take 20-30 minutes to complete a survey is an imposition on your time; yet, your responses are essential. We would appreciate your responding to the items and then returning the survey in the enclosed envelope. Your perceptions will, of course, be anonymous. We need and value your thoughts.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Richard C. Schafer
Project Director

Jeanette C. Murphy
Research Associate

Jerry Valentine
Project Coordinator

THE MISSOURI CAREER LADDER IMPLEMENTATION SURVEY
SUPERINTENDENT FORM P

PURPOSE OF THE SURVEY IS TO IDENTIFY THE REASONS FOR DISTRICT PARTICIPATION OR NONPARTICIPATION IN THE CAREER LADDER PROGRAM AS SET FORTH IN MISSOURI LAW WITHIN THE EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION ACT OF 1985.

TO ASSIST YOU WITH YOUR RESPONSES TO THIS SURVEY, A BRIEF OUTLINE OF THE MISSOURI CAREER LADDER PLAN MODEL AS WELL AS A COPY OF THE ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR CAREER LADDER TEACHERS ARE ATTACHED.

PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER OF THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE.

1. Degree(s): (1) Bachelor
(2) Master
(3) Master's Plus
(4) Specialist
(5) Doctorate

2. Sex: (1) Male
(2) Female

3. Age: (1) 23 or under
(2) 24-29
(3) 30-34
(4) 35-39
(5) 40-44
(6) 45-49
(7) 50-54
(8) 55-59
(9) 60 or older

4. Years teaching experience: (1) 5 or less
(2) 6-10 years
(3) 11-15 years
(4) 16 or more

5. Years experience as a Superintendent: (1) 5 years or less
(2) 6-10 years
(3) 11-15 years
(4) 16 years or more

6. Years Superintendent in this district (include current year): (1) 5 years or less
(2) 6-10 years
(3) 11-15 years
(4) 16 years or more

7. Classification of district in which you are the Superintendent:
(1) Metropolitan (St. Louis City)
(2) Urban (Kansas City, Springfield, Independence, St. Joseph)
(3) Six-director: Jackson or St. Louis counties
(4) Six-director: containing a city of 25,000 to 70,000
(5) Six-director: containing a city of 5,000 to 24,999
(6) Six-director: containing a city of less than 5,000
(7) Special school district

8. Salary level:
(1) less than $20,000
(2) $20,000-24,999
(3) 25,000-29,999
(4) $30,000-34,999
(5) $35,000-39,999
(6) $40,000 or more

9. Number of students enrolled in your district as of October 1, 1986.
   (1) 300 or less
   (2) 301-800
   (3) 801-1500
   (4) 1501-3000
   (5) 3001-5000
   (6) 5001-10000
   (7) 10001-15000
   (8) 15001 or more

10. Classification of your district:
   (1) AAA
   (2) AA
   (3) A

11. WHAT IS THE CURRENT YEAR'S TEACHER/STUDENT RATIO (CLASS SIZE) IN YOUR DISTRICT?

1	2	3	4	5
1 teacher/ 10 or less students	1 teacher/ 11-20 students	1 teacher/ 21-25 students	1 teacher/ 26-30 students	1 teacher/ 31 or more students

12. WHAT WAS THE AVERAGE PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE (EXCLUSIVE OF CAPITAL OUTLAY) FOR EACH STUDENT IN YOUR DISTRICT DURING THE 1985-86 SCHOOL YEAR?

1	2	3	4	5	6
$500 or less	$501 $1000	$1001 $1500	$1501 $2000	$2001 $2500	$2501 or more

13. WHEN YOU FIRST BECAME AWARE THAT THE STATE OF MISSOURI WAS CONSIDERING A CAREER DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR TEACHERS AS STATE POLICY (SUBSEQUENTLY THE CAREER LADDER PLAN), WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING WAS THE SOURCE OF YOUR INFORMATION. (Please circle the number of as many responses as are appropriate.)

1. informal discussion with other Superintendents
2. newspaper
3. television
4. radio
5. professional magazines
6. professional organization meetings
7. legislative meetings
8. legislative communiques
9. Department of Elementary and Secondary Education bulletins
10. Department of Elementary and Secondary Education workshops
11. other (indicate) _____

For questions 14-17 please circle the number of the most appropriate response.

14. INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH PUBLICITY FROM OTHER DISTRICTS OR STATES INFLUENCED YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT CAREER LADDER PLANS.

1	2	3	4	5
highly negative influence	somewhat negative influence	no influence	somewhat positive influence	highly positive influence

15. INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION INFLUENCED YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT CAREER LADDER PLANS.

1	2	3	4	5
highly negative influence	somewhat negative influence	no influence	somewhat positive influence	highly positive influence

16. TO WHAT DEGREE WAS THE OPPORTUNITY TO SUPPLEMENT CURRENT TEACHER SALARIES AN IMPORTANT FACTOR LEADING TO THE DECISION TO IMPLEMENT A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN.

1	2	3	4	5
not important		somewhat important		highly important

17. IN WHAT WAY WAS THE CAREER LADDER PLAN FORMALLY INTRODUCED TO YOU IN YOUR DISTRICT?

1. presented at a state sponsored workshop
2. presented through a district workshop
3. has not been formally presented to me
4. other (indicate) _____

18. YOUR DISTRICT HAS DECIDED TO IMPLEMENT A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING BEST DESCRIBES HOW IT WAS DEVELOPED? (Please circle the number of the most appropriate response.)

1. A district committee of teachers, principals, and central office administrators studied Career Ladder issues and models, developed a plan and made a recommendation to the board.

2. A district committee of principals and central office administrators studied Career Ladder issues and models, developed a plan and made a recommendation to the board.

3. A district committee of building administrators studied Career Ladder issues and models, developed a plan and made a recommendation to the board.

4. District administrators reviewed the state Career Ladder Plan Model and recommended that model to the board without formal committee input from teaching staff.

5. District Board of Education members reviewed the state Career Ladder Plan Model and adopted it for implementation without formal committee input from central administration or teaching staff.

6. Other (PLEASE EXPLAIN) _____

_____

_____

_____

19. YOUR DISTRICT HAS ADOPTED A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN. IS IT: (See attachment for assistance with your answer. Please circle the number of the appropriate response.)

1. identical to the Missouri Career Ladder Plan Model
2. a modified version of the Missouri Career Ladder Plan Model
3. a district created plan not very similar to the Missouri Career Ladder Plan Model
4. other _____

_____

_____

_____

20. IN YOUR OPINION, THE REASONS WHY YOUR DISTRICT DID DEVELOP A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN INCLUDE: (Please circle the number of no more than 3 responses.)

1. because it is available
2. recognition of teachers
3. another way of getting extra dollars
4. encourage excellence in education
5. enhance student learning
6. percent of state contribution was a factor
7. political pressure
8. teachers in favor of participation
9. administrators in favor of participation
10. superintendent recommendation
11. to attract qualified teacher applicants
12. other (indicate) _____

21. HOW MANY CLASSROOM TEACHERS ARE EMPLOYED IN YOUR DISTRICT? _____

22. OF THIS NUMBER, APPROXIMATELY HOW MANY TEACHERS IN YOUR DISTRICT MEET THE REQUIREMENT OF TEACHING 5 YEARS AND ARE THUS ELIGIBLE TO APPLY FOR PARTICIPATION IN A CAREER LADDER PLAN? _____

23. OF THOSE DESCRIBED IN ITEM 22, WHAT PERCENT DO YOU BELIEVE WILL APPLY FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN?
_____%

24. DID YOUR DISTRICT ADOPT A LEVY INCREASE TO SUPPORT THE CAREER LADDER PLAN?

1. Yes 2. No

25. IF NOT, DOES YOUR DISTRICT PLAN TO SUBMIT A LEVY PROPOSAL IN ORDER TO SUPPORT THE CAREER LADDER PLAN?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Undecided

26. CIRCLE THE THREE (3) ITEMS ON THE FOLLOWING LIST WHICH YOU BELIEVE WILL MOST LIKELY MOTIVATE TEACHERS TO PARTICIPATE IN A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN.

1. challenge
2. greater responsibility
3. opportunity to participate in district level activities
4. recognition
5. additional compensation
6. self-evaluation of performance
7. setting own goals
8. student achievement
9. other (indicate) _____

27. WHAT IS YOUR OPINION ABOUT THE APPROPRIATENESS OF THE PERFORMANCE BASED TEACHER EVALUATION BEING A REQUIRED PART OF THE CAREER LADDER MODEL? (Please circle the number of the appropriate response.)

1	2	3	4	5
very inappropriate	inappropriate	indifferent	appropriate	very appropriate

28. WHO IS PRIMARILY RESPONSIBLE FOR TEACHER EVALUATIONS? (Please circle the number of as many responses as are appropriate)

1. Principal
2. Superintendent
3. Assistant Principal
4. Supervisor
5. Teacher Teams
6. Teacher/Administrator Team
7. Other (indicate) _____
_____

USING THE FOLLOWING CODE, PLEASE RESPOND TO EACH STATEMENT BY PLACING IN THE BLANK THE NUMBER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS.

1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=indifferent, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree

A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN WILL TEND TO:

___29. increase competition among teachers.

___30. increase respect for teachers.

___31. be too complicated.

___32. be too political.

___33. foster individual effort.

___34. recognize team effort.

___35. discourage sharing of material and ideas among teachers.

___36. cause teachers to be less open to cooperation with each other.

___37. motivate only those who are already motivated.

___38. recognize excellence in teaching.

___39. create a climate adverse to student learning.

___40. cause teachers to remain in the classroom.

___41. encourage excellent teachers to remain in the system.

___42. cause money and status to become more important than teaching itself.

___43. encourage teachers to leave the classroom.

___44. cause teachers to spend more time on administrative tasks and less time on teaching.

___45. increase student learning.

___46. increase professionalism among teachers.

___47. cause students and parents to request career ladder teachers rather than those who are not on the ladder.

___48. focus on classroom teaching.

___49. cause competition to replace support in the school environment.

USING THE FOLLOWING CODE, PLEASE RESPOND TO EACH STATEMENT BY PLACING IN THE BLANK THE NUMBER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS.

1-strongly disagree, 2-disagree, 3-indifferent, 4-agree, 5-strongly agree

A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN WILL TEND TO:

___50. define what it means to be a good teacher.

___51. create a quota system relating to the number of teachers who can participate in each stage of the Plan.

___52. lower teacher and school morale.

___53. discourage beginning teachers because five years is too long to wait in order to participate.

___54. encourage higher quality teacher applicants to seek employment in the district.

___55. decrease cooperativeness among teachers with administrators.

USING THE FOLLOWING CODE, PLEASE RESPOND TO EACH STATEMENT BY PLACING IN THE BLANK THE NUMBER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS.

1-strongly disagree, 2-disagree, 3-indifferent, 4-agree, 5-strongly agree

___56. Including only teachers, counselors and librarians for participation in the Career Ladder Plan is appropriate.

___57. The salary supplements allowed by the Excellence in Education Act of 1985 for successfully participating in a District Career Ladder Plan are inadequate compensation for the additional work requirements.

___58. A teacher having an individual choice to participate or not participate in a District Career Ladder Plan is appropriate.

___59. The Career Ladder Plan is basically a reward system for superior teaching.

___60. A district should participate in a District Career Ladder Plan because the plan should enhance instruction, improve curriculum development, and improve student learning in the district.

___61. Because a District Career Ladder Plan should be promoting professional growth, a teacher should participate.

___62. According to the wording of the Missouri law pertaining to Career Ladders, "any teacher who declines to participate shall not be penalized in any way." This will be honored in our district.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

USING THE FOLLOWING CODE, PLEASE PLACE IN THE BLANK, THE NUMBER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS.

1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=indifferent, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree

___63. There is apathy among our teachers about participation in the District Career Ladder Plan.

___64. The State of Missouri should establish a Career Ladder Plan for Administrators.

___65. Parents should be included in the development and implementation of a District Career Ladder Plan.

___66. Career Ladder Plan guidelines should be drawn up so that teachers know what is expected of them.

___67. Provisions should be made for additional compensation for Administrators to recognize the increase in work and paper load.

___68. Over the next five years, District Career Ladder Plans will help retain high quality teachers in Missouri.

___69. Over the next five years, District Career Ladder Plans will help improve the quality of instruction for students in Missouri.

___70. Over the next five years, District Career Ladder Plans will help improve teacher professionalism in Missouri.

___71. Over the next five years, District Career Ladder Plans will help improve student achievement in Missouri.

72. THE PURPOSE OF THE CAREER LADDER PORTION OF THE EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION ACT OF 1985 WAS TO RETAIN HIGH QUALITY TEACHERS IN MISSOURI CLASSROOMS. IF YOU BELIEVE THERE ARE MORE APPROPRIATE WAYS TO ACHIEVE THIS GOAL, PLEASE DESCRIBE THEM BELOW.

THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO RESPOND TO THIS SURVEY.

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-COLUMBIA

College of Education

Office of the Dean

October 3, 1986

Dear President, Board of Education:

Career Ladders is a new concept in Missouri. When the Missouri State Legislature passed the "career ladder" legislation in the spring of 1985, there were expectations that a large percentage of school districts in Missouri would choose to participate in the program. This has not been the case during 1986-87, with less than seventy districts being involved. To understand why some districts did, or did not, participate and to understand the attitudes of teachers, principals, superintendents and school board members regarding career ladders is critical information for legislators and educators as they explore future directions. The purpose of the enclosed survey is to identify those reasons and attitudes.

This study is a joint effort between the Missouri House of Representatives and the University of Missouri-Columbia, College of Education, Office of Research and Development, with funding from the National Conference of State Legislatures' Committee on Education and Labor. It is anticipated that the results of this study will reach beyond Missouri to also benefit other states that are studying the issues of career ladders and teacher incentive programs.

We know that to ask you to take 20-30 minutes to complete a survey is an imposition on your time; yet, your responses are essential. We would appreciate your responding to the items and then returning the survey in the enclosed envelope. Your perceptions will, of course, be anonymous. We need and value your thoughts.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Richard C. Schoter
Project Director

Jeanette C. Murphy
Research Associate

Jerry Valentine
Project Coordinator

THE MISSOURI CAREER LADDER IMPLEMENTATION SURVEY
BOARD OF EDUCATION FORM P

PURPOSE OF THE SURVEY IS TO IDENTIFY THE REASONS FOR DISTRICT PARTICIPATION OR NONPARTICIPATION IN THE CAREER LADDER PROGRAM AS SET FORTH IN MISSOURI LAW WITHIN THE EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION ACT OF 1985.

TO ASSIST YOU WITH YOUR RESPONSES TO THIS SURVEY, A BRIEF OUTLINE OF THE MISSOURI CAREER LADDER PLAN MODEL AS WELL AS A COPY OF THE ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR CAREER LADDER TEACHERS ARE ATTACHED.

PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER OF THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE.

1. Education: (1) high school diploma
(2) college degree
(3) vocational training
(4) other (indicate) ___

2. Years served on Board of Education:
(1) 3 years or less
(2) 4-6 years
(3) 7-9 years
(4) 10-12 years
(5) more than 12 years

4. Sex: (1) Male
(2) Female

5. Age: (1) 23 or under
(2) 24-29
(3) 30-34
(4) 35-39
(5) 40-44
(6) 45-49
(7) 50-54
(8) 55-59
(9) 60 or older

3. Profession or occupation_____

6. Classification of district in which you are a Board Member:
(1) Metropolitan (St. Louis City)
(2) Urban (Kansas City, Springfield, Independence, St. Joseph)
(3) Six-director: Jackson or St. Louis counties
(4) Six-director: containing a city of 25,000 to 70,000
(5) Six-director: containing a city of 5,000 to 24,999
(6) Six-director: containing a city of less than 5,000
(7) Special school district

7. WHEN YOU FIRST BECAME AWARE THAT THE STATE OF MISSOURI WAS CONSIDERING A CAREER DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR TEACHERS AS STATE POLICY (SUBSEQUENTLY THE CAREER LADDER PLAN), WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING WAS THE SOURCE OF YOUR INFORMATION. (Please circle the number of as many responses as are appropriate.)

1. informal discussion with other members of Boards of Education
2. newspaper
3. television
4. radio
5. professional magazines
6. professional organization meetings
7. district administration
8. legislative meetings
9. legislative communiques
10. Department of Elementary and Secondary Education bulletins
11. Department of Elementary and Secondary Education workshops
12. other (indicate) _____

For questions 8-11, please circle the number of the most appropriate response.

8. INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH PUBLICITY FROM OTHER DISTRICTS OR STATES INFLUENCED YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT CAREER LADDER PLANS.

1	2	3	4	5
highly negative influence	somewhat negative influence	no influence	somewhat positive influence	highly positive influence

9. INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION INFLUENCED YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT CAREER LADDER PLANS.

1	2	3	4	5
highly negative influence	somewhat negative influence	no influence	somewhat positive influence	highly positive influence

10. INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOUR SUPERINTENDENT INFLUENCED YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT CAREER LADDER PLANS.

1	2	3	4	5
highly negative influence	somewhat negative influence	no influence	somewhat positive influence	highly positive influence

11. IN WHAT WAY WAS THE CAREER LADDER PLAN FIRST FORMALLY INTRODUCED TO YOU IN YOUR DISTRICT?

1. presented at a state sponsored workshop
2. presented through a district workshop
3. has not been formally presented to me
4. other (indicate) _____

12. YOUR DISTRICT HAS DECIDED TO IMPLEMENT A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING BEST DESCRIBES HOW IT WAS DEVELOPED? (Please circle the number of the most appropriate response.)

1. A district committee of teachers, principals, and central office administrators studied Career Ladder issues and models, developed a plan and made a recommendation to the board.

2. A district committee of principals and central office administrators studied Career Ladder issues and models, developed a plan and made a recommendation to the board.

3. A district committee of building administrators studied Career Ladder issues and models, developed a plan and made a recommendation to the board.

4. District administrators reviewed the state Career Ladder Plan Model and recommended that model to the board without formal committee input from teaching staff.

5. District Board of Education members reviewed the state Career Ladder Plan Model and adopted it for implementation without formal committee input from central administration or teaching staff.

6. Other (PLEASE EXPLAIN): _____

13. YOUR DISTRICT HAS ADOPTED A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN. IS IT: (See attachment for assistance with your answer. Please circle the number of the appropriate response.)

1. identical to the Missouri Career Ladder Plan Model
2. a modified version of the Missouri Career Ladder Plan Model
3. a district created plan not very similar to the Missouri Career Ladder Plan Model
4. I don't know

14. IN YOUR OPINION, THE REASONS WHY YOUR DISTRICT DID DEVELOP A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN INCLUDE: (Please circle the number of no more than 3 responses.)

1. because it is available
2. recognition of teachers
3. another way of getting extra dollars
4. encourage excellence in education
5. enhance student learning
6. percent of state contribution was a factor
7. political pressure
8. teachers in favor of participation
9. administrators in favor of participation
10. superintendent recommendation
11. to attract qualified teachers when vacancies occur
12. other (indicate) _____

For questions 15-17, please circle the number of the most appropriate response.

15. TO WHAT DEGREE WAS THE OPPORTUNITY TO SUPPLEMENT CURRENT TEACHER SALARIES AN IMPORTANT FACTOR LEADING TO THE DECISION TO IMPLEMENT A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN

1	2	3	4	5
not important		somewhat important		highly important

16. DID YOUR DISTRICT ADOPT A LEVY INCREASE TO SUPPORT THE CAREER LADDER PLAN?

1. Yes 2. No

17. IF NOT, DOES YOUR DISTRICT PLAN TO SUBMIT A LEVY PROPOSAL IN ORDER TO SUPPORT THE CAREER LADDER PLAN?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Undecided

18. CIRCLE THE THREE (3) ITEMS ON THE FOLLOWING LIST WHICH YOU BELIEVE WILL MOST LIKELY MOTIVATE TEACHERS TO PARTICIPATE IN A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN.

1. challenge
2. greater responsibility
3. opportunity to participate in district level activities
4. recognition
5. additional compensation
6. self-evaluation of performance
7. setting own goals
8. student achievement
9. other (indicate) _____

19. WHAT IS YOUR OPINION ABOUT THE APPROPRIATENESS OF THE PERFORMANCE BASED TEACHER EVALUATION BEING A REQUIRED PART OF THE CAREER LADDER MODEL? (Please circle the number of the appropriate response.)

1	2	3	4	5
very inappropriate	inappropriate	indifferent	appropriate	very appropriate

20. WHO IS PRIMARILY RESPONSIBLE FOR TEACHER EVALUATIONS? (Please circle the number of as many responses as are appropriate)

1. Principal
2. Superintendent
3. Assistant Principal
4. Supervisor
5. Teacher Teams
6. Teacher/Administrator Team
7. Other (Indicate) _____

_____

USING THE FOLLOWING CODE, PLEASE RESPOND TO EACH STATEMENT BY PLACING IN THE BLANK THE NUMBER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS:

1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=indifferent, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree

A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN WILL TEND TO:

___21. increase competition among teachers.

___22. increase respect for teachers.

___23. be too complicated.

___24. be too political.

___25. foster individual effort.

___26. recognize team effort.

___27. discourage sharing of material and ideas among teachers.

___28. cause teachers to be less open and cooperative with each other.

___29. motivate only those who are already motivated.

___30. recognize excellence in teaching.

___31. create a climate adverse to student learning.

___32. cause teachers to remain in the classroom.

___33. encourage excellent teachers to remain in the system.

USING THE FOLLOWING CODE, PLEASE RESPOND TO EACH STATEMENT BY PLACING IN THE BLANK THE NUMBER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS.

1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=indifferent, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree

A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER WILL TEND TO:

___34. cause money and status to become more important than teaching itself.

___35. encourage teachers to leave the classroom.

___36. cause teachers to spend more time on administrative tasks and less time on teaching.

___37. increase student learning.

___38. increase professionalism among teachers.

___39. cause students and parents to request Career Ladder teachers rather than those who are not on the Ladder.

___40. focus on classroom teaching.

___41. cause nonparticipants to be thought of as less effective teachers.

___42. define what it means to be a good teacher.

___43. create a quota system relating to the number of teachers who can participate in each stage of the Plan.

___44. lower teacher and student morale.

___45. discourage beginning teachers because five years is too long to wait in order to participate.

___46. encourage quality teacher applicants to seek employment in the district.

___47. decrease cooperativeness among teachers with administrators.

USING THE FOLLOWING CODE, PLEASE RESPOND TO EACH STATEMENT BY PLACING IN THE BLANK THE NUMBER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS.

1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=indifferent, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree

___48. Including only teachers, counselors and librarians for participation in the Career Ladder Plan is appropriate.

___49. The salary supplements allowed by the Excellence in Education Act of 1985 for successfully participating in a District Career Ladder Plan are inadequate compensation for the additional work requirements.

___50. A teacher having an individual choice to participate or not participate in a District Career Ladder Plan is appropriate.

___51. The Career Ladder Plan is basically a reward system for superior teaching.

___52. A district should participate in a District Career Ladder Plan because the plan should enhance instruction, improve curriculum development, and improve student learning in the district.

___53. Because a District Career Ladder Plan should be promoting professional growth, a teacher should participate.

___54. According to the wording of the Missouri law pertaining to Career Ladders, "any teacher who declines to participate shall not be penalized in any way." This will be honored in our district.

___55. There is apathy among our teachers about participation in the District Career Ladder Plan.

___56. The State of Missouri should establish a Career Ladder Plan for Administrators.

___57. Parents should be included in the development and implementation of a District Career Ladder Plan.

___58. Career Ladder Plan guidelines should be drawn up so that teachers know what is expected of them.

___59. Provisions should be made for additional compensation for Administrators to recognize the increase in work and paper load.

___60. Over the next five years, District Career Ladder Plans will help retain high quality teachers in Missouri.

USING THE FOLLOWING CODE, PLEASE PLACE IN THE BLANK, THE NUMBER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS.

1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=indifferent, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree

__61. Over the next five years, District Career Ladder Plans will help improve the quality of instruction for students in Missouri.

__62. Over the next five years, District Career Ladder Plans will help improve teacher professionalism in Missouri.

__63. Over the next five years, District Career Ladder Plans will help improve student achievement in Missouri.

64. THE PURPOSE OF THE CAREER LADDER PORTION OF THE EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION ACT OF 1985 WAS TO RETAIN HIGH QUALITY TEACHERS IN MISSOURI CLASSROOMS. IF YOU BELIEVE THERE ARE MORE APPROPRIATE WAYS TO ACHIEVE THIS GOAL, PLEASE DESCRIBE THEM BELOW.

THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO RESPOND TO THIS SURVEY.

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-COLUMBIA

College of Education

Office of the Dean

109 114 Hill Hall
Columbia, MO 65211-0211
Telephone (314) 882-8311

October 3, 1986

Dear Teacher:

Career Ladders is a new concept in Missouri. When the Missouri State Legislature passed the "career ladder" legislation in the spring of 1985, there were expectations that a large percentage of school districts in Missouri would choose to participate in the program. This has not been the case during 1986-87, with less than seventy districts being involved. To understand why some districts did, or did not, participate and to understand the attitudes of teachers, principals, superintendents and school board members regarding career ladders is critical information for legislators and educators as they explore future directions. The purpose of the enclosed survey is to identify those reasons and attitudes.

This study is a joint effort between the Missouri House of Representatives and the University of Missouri-Columbia, College of Education, Office of Research and Development, with funding from the National Conference of State Legislatures' Committee on Education and Labor. It is anticipated that the results of this study will reach beyond Missouri to also benefit other states that are studying the issues of career ladders and teacher incentive programs.

We know that to ask you to take 20-30 minutes to complete a survey is an imposition on your time; yet, your responses are essential. We would appreciate your responding to the items and then returning the survey in the enclosed envelope. Your perceptions will, of course, be anonymous. We need and value your thoughts.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Richard C. Schofer
Project Director

Jeanette C. Murphy
Research Associate

Jerry Valentine
Project Coordinator

An equal opportunity employer

THE MISSOURI CAREER LADDER IMPLEMENTATION SURVEY
TEACHER FORM N

PURPOSE OF THE SURVEY IS TO IDENTIFY THE REASONS FOR DISTRICT PARTICIPATION OR NONPARTICIPATION IN THE CAREER LADDER PROGRAM AS SET FORTH IN MISSOURI LAW WITHIN THE EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION ACT OF 1985.

TO ASSIST YOU WITH YOUR RESPONSES TO THIS SURVEY, A BRIEF OUTLINE OF THE MISSOURI CAREER LADDER PLAN MODEL AS WELL AS A COPY OF THE ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR CAREER LADDER TEACHERS ARE ATTACHED.

PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER OF THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE.

1. Teaching level: (1) Elementary School
(2) Junior High/Middle School
(3) Secondary School

2. Subject Area(s): _____

3. Degree(s): (1) Bachelor
(2) Master
(3) Master's Plus
(4) Specialist
(5) Doctorate

4. Sex: (1) Male
(2) Female

5. Age: (1) 23 or under
(2) 24-29
(3) 30-34
(4) 35-39
(5) 40-44
(6) 45-49
(7) 50-54
(8) 55-59
(9) 60 or older

6. Years taught (include current): (1) 5 or less
(2) 6-10 years
(3) 11-15 years
(4) 16 or more

7. Years taught in this school (include current): (1) 5 years or less
(2) 6-10 years
(3) 11-15 years
(4) 16 years or more

8. Do you have tenure: (1) Yes
(2) No

9. Classification of district in which you teach:
(1) Metropolitan (St. Louis City)
(2) Urban (Kansas City, Springfield, Independence, St. Joseph)
(3) Six-director: Jackson or St. Louis counties
(4) Six-director: containing a city of 25,000 to 70,000
(5) Six-director: containing a city of 5,000 to 24,999
(6) Six-director: containing a city of less than 5,000
(7) Special school district

10. Salary level:
(1) less than $16,000
(2) $16,000-19,999
(3) $20,000-24,999
(4) 25,000-29,999
(5) $30,000 or more

11. WHEN YOU FIRST BECAME AWARE THAT THE STATE OF MISSOURI WAS CONSIDERING A CAREER DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR TEACHERS AS STATE POLICY (SUBSEQUENTLY THE CAREER LADDER PLAN), WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING WAS THE SOURCE OF YOUR INFORMATION. (Please circle the number of as many responses as are appropriate.)

1. informal discussion with other teachers
2. newspaper
3. television
4. radio
5. professional magazines
6. professional organization meetings
7. supervisors, i.e., Principal, Superintendent
8. legislative meetings
9. legislative communiques
10. Department of Elementary and Secondary Education bulletins
11. Department of Elementary and Secondary Education workshops
12. other (indicate) _____

For questions 12-14, please circle the most appropriate response.

12. INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH PUBLICITY FROM OTHER DISTRICTS OR STATES INFLUENCED YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT CAREER LADDER PLANS.

1	2	3	4	5
highly negative influence	somewhat negative influence	no influence	somewhat positive influence	highly positive influence

13. INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION INFLUENCED YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT CAREER LADDER PLANS.

1	2	3	4	5
highly negative influence	somewhat negative influence	no influence	somewhat positive influence	highly positive influence

14. IN WHAT WAY WAS THE CAREER LADDER PLAN FORMALLY INTRODUCED TO YOU IN YOUR DISTRICT?

1. presented at a state sponsored workshop
2. presented through a district workshop
3. has not been formally presented to me
4. other (indicate) _____

15. YOUR DISTRICT HAS DECIDED NOT TO IMPLEMENT A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN DURING THE 86-87 SCHOOL YEAR. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING BEST DESCRIBES HOW THAT DECISION WAS REACHED. (Please circle the number of the most appropriate response.)

1. A district committee of teachers, principals, and central office administrators studied Career Ladder issues and models and made a recommendation to the board.

2. A district committee of principals and central office administrators studied Career Ladder issues and models and made a recommendation to the board.

3. A district committee of building administrators studied Career Ladder issues and models and made a recommendation to the board.

4. District administrators reviewed the state Career Ladder Plan Model and made a recommendation to the board without formal committee input from teaching staff.

5. District Board of Education members reviewed the state Career Ladder Plan Model and made the decision not to participate without formal committee input from central administration or teaching staff.

6. Other (PLEASE EXPLAIN): _____

_____

_____

16. IN YOUR OPINION, THE REASONS WHY YOUR DISTRICT DID NOT DEVELOP A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN INCLUDE: (Please circle the number of no more than 3 responses.)

1. all teachers would not receive recognition
2. would not encourage excellence in education
3. would not enhance student learning
4. percent of state contribution was a factor
5. political pressure
6. teachers resistance to participation
7. administrators resistance to participation
8. superintendent recommendation
9. would not help to attract qualified teachers
10. other (indicate) _____

17. YOUR DISTRICT DOES NOT HAVE A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN BUT YOU WOULD LIKE TO PARTICIPATE IN ONE, WHAT 3 REASONS BEST DESCRIBE YOUR MOTIVATION? (Please circle the appropriate numbers for your response.)

1. challenge
2. greater responsibility
3. opportunity to participate in district level activities
4. recognition
5. additional compensation
6. self-evaluation of performance
7. setting own goals
8. student achievement
9. other (indicate) _____

18. WHAT IS YOUR OPINION ABOUT THE APPROPRIATENESS OF THE PERFORMANCE BASED TEACHER EVALUATION BEING A REQUIRED PART OF THE CAREER LADDER MODEL? (Please circle the number of the most appropriate response.)

1	2	3	4	5
very inappropriate	inappropriate	indifferent	appropriate	very appropriate

19. WHO IS PRIMARILY RESPONSIBLE FOR TEACHER EVALUATIONS? (Please circle the number of as many responses as are appropriate)

1. Principal
2. Superintendent
3. Assistant Principal
4. Supervisor
5. Teacher Teams
6. Teacher/Administrator Team
7. other (indicate) _____

USING THE FOLLOWING CODE, PLEASE RESPOND TO EACH STATEMENT BY PLACING IN THE BLANK THE NUMBER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS.

1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=indifferent, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree

A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN WILL TEND TO:

___20. increase competition among teachers.

___21. increase respect for teachers.

___22. be too complicated.

___23. be too political.

___24. foster individual effort.

USING THE FOLLOWING CODE, PLEASE RESPOND TO EACH STATEMENT BY PLACING IN THE BLANK THE NUMBER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS.

1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=indifferent, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree

A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN WILL TEND TO:

___25. recognize team effort.

___26. discourage sharing of material and ideas among teachers.

___27. cause teachers to be less open and cooperative with each other.

___28. motivate only those who are already motivated.

___29. recognize excellence in teaching.

___30. create a climate adverse to student learning.

___31. cause teachers to remain in the classroom.

___32. encourage excellent teachers to remain in the system.

___33. cause money and status to become more important than teaching itself.

___34. encourage teachers to leave the classroom.

___35. cause teachers to spend more time on administrative tasks and less time on teaching.

___36. increase student learning.

___37. increase professionalism among teachers.

___38. cause students and parents to request Career Ladder teachers rather than those who are not on the Ladder.

___39. focus on classroom teaching.

___40. cause nonparticipants to be thought of as less effective teachers.

___41. define what it means to be a good teacher.

___42. create a quota system relating to the number of teachers who can participate in each stage of the Plan.

___43. lower teacher and student morale.

___44. discourage beginning teachers because five years is too long to wait in order to participate.

___45. encourage quality teacher applicants to seek employment in the district.

USING THE FOLLOWING CODE, PLEASE RESPOND TO EACH STATEMENT BY PLACING IN THE BLANK THE NUMBER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS.

1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=indifferent, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree

___46. Including only teachers, counselors and librarians for participation in the Career Ladder Plan is appropriate.

___47. The salary supplements allowed by the Excellence in Education Act of 1985 for successfully participating in a District Career Ladder Plan are inadequate compensation for the additional work requirements.

___48. Having an individual choice to participate or not participate in a District Career Ladder Plan is appropriate.

___49. The Career Ladder Plan is basically a reward system for superior teaching.

___50. A district should participate in a District Career Ladder Plan because the plan should enhance instruction, improve curriculum development, and improve student learning in the district.

___51. Because a District Career Ladder Plan should be promoting professional growth, a teacher should participate.

___52. According to the wording of the Missouri law pertaining to Career Ladders, "any teacher who declines to participate shall not be penalized in any way." This will be honored in our district.

___53. There is apathy among my colleagues about participation in the District Career Ladder Plan.

___54. Over the next five years, District Career Ladder Plans will help retain high quality teachers in Missouri.

___55. Over the next five years, District Career Ladder Plans will help improve the quality of instruction for students in Missouri.

USING THE FOLLOWING CODE, PLEASE PLACE IN THE BLANK, THE NUMBER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS.

1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=indifferent, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree

___56. Over the next five years, District Career Ladder Plans will help improve teacher professionalism in Missouri.

___57. Over the next five years, District Career Ladder Plans will help improve student achievement in Missouri.

58. THE PURPOSE OF THE CAREER LADDER PORTION OF THE EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION ACT OF 1985 WAS TO RETAIN HIGH QUALITY TEACHERS IN MISSOURI CLASSROOMS. IF YOU BELIEVE THERE ARE MORE APPROPRIATE WAYS TO ACHIEVE THIS GOAL, PLEASE DESCRIBE THEM BELOW.

THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO RESPOND TO THIS SURVEY.

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-COLUMBIA

College of Education

Office of the Dean

October 3, 1986

Dear Principal:

Career Ladders is a new concept in Missouri. When the Missouri State Legislature passed the "career ladder" legislation in the spring of 1985, there were expectations that a large percentage of school districts in Missouri would choose to participate in the program. This has not been the case during 1986-87, with less than seventy districts being involved. To understand why some districts did, or did not, participate and to understand the attitudes of teachers, principals, superintendents and school board members regarding career ladders is critical information for legislators and educators as they explore future directions. The purpose of the enclosed survey is to identify those reasons and attitudes.

This study is a joint effort between the Missouri House of Representatives and the University of Missouri-Columbia, College of Education, Office of Research and Development, with funding from the National Conference of State Legislatures' Committee on Education and Labor. It is anticipated that the results of this study will reach beyond Missouri to also benefit other states that are studying the issues of career ladders and teacher incentive programs.

We know that to ask you to take 20-30 minutes to complete a survey is an imposition on your time; yet, your responses are essential. We would appreciate your responding to the items and then returning the survey in the enclosed envelope. Your perceptions will, of course, be anonymous. We need and value your thoughts.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Richard C. Schafer
Project Director

Jeanette C. Murphy
Research Associate

Jerry Valentine
Project Coordinator

THE MISSOURI CAREER LADDER IMPLEMENTATION SURVEY
PRINCIPAL FORM N

PURPOSE OF THE SURVEY IS TO IDENTIFY THE REASONS FOR DISTRICT PARTICIPATION OR NONPARTICIPATION IN THE CAREER LADDER PROGRAM AS SET FORTH IN MISSOURI LAW WITHIN THE EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION ACT OF 1985.

TO ASSIST YOU WITH YOUR RESPONSES TO THIS SURVEY, A BRIEF OUTLINE OF THE MISSOURI CAREER LADDER PLAN MODEL AS WELL AS A COPY OF THE ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR CAREER LADDER TEACHERS ARE ATTACHED.

PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER OF THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE.

1. Administrative level: (1) Elementary School
(2) Junior High/Middle School
(3) Secondary School

2. Degree(s): (1) Bachelor
(2) Master
(3) Master's Plus
(4) Specialist
(5) Doctorate

3. Sex: (1) Male
(2) Female

4. Age: (1) 23 or under
(2) 24-29
(3) 30-34
(4) 35-39
(5) 40-44
(6) 45-49
(7) 50-54
(8) 55-59
(9) 60 or older

5. Years teaching experience: (1) 5 or less
(2) 6-10 years
(3) 11-15 years
(4) 16 or more

6. Years experience as a Principal: (1) 5 years or less
(2) 6-10 years
(3) 11-15 years
(4) 16 years or more

7. Years Principal in this school (include current year) (1) 5 years or less
(2) 6-10 years
(3) 11-15 years
(4) 16 years or more

8. Classification of district in which you are a Principal: (1) Metropolitan (St. Louis City)
(2) Urban (Kansas City, Springfield, Independence, St. Joseph)
(3) Six-director: Jackson or St. Louis counties
(4) Six-director: containing a city of 25,000 to 70,000
(5) Six-director: containing a city of 5,000 to 24,999
(6) Six-director: containing a city of less than 5,000
(7) Special school district

9. Salary level:
(1) less than $20,000
(2) $20,000-24,999
(3) 25,000-29,999
(4) $30,000-34,999
(5) $35,000-39,999
(6) $40,000 or more

10. Number of students enrolled in your district as of October 1, 1986:
(1) 300 or less
(2) 301-800
(3) 801-1500
(4) 1501-3000
(5) 3001-5000
(6) 5001-10000
(7) 10001-15000
(8) 15001 or more

11. Classification of your district:
(1) AAA
(2) AA
(3) U

12. WHEN YOU FIRST BECAME AWARE THAT THE STATE OF MISSOURI WAS CONSIDERING A CAREER DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR TEACHERS AS STATE POLICY (SUBSEQUENTLY THE CAREER LADDER PLAN), WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING WAS THE SOURCE OF YOUR INFORMATION. (Please circle the number of as many responses as are appropriate.)

1. informal discussion with other Principals
2. newspaper
3. television
4. radio
5. professional magazines
6. professional organization meetings
7. supervisors, i.e., Superintendent
8. legislative meetings
9. legislative communiques
10. Department of Elementary and Secondary Education bulletins
11. Department of Elementary and Secondary Education workshops
12. other (indicate) _____

For questions 13-16 please circle the number of the most appropriate response.

13. INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH PUBLICITY FROM OTHER DISTRICTS OR STATES INFLUENCED YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT CAREER LADDER PLANS.

1	2	3	4	5
highly negative influence	somewhat negative influence	no influence	somewhat positive influence	highly positive influence

14. INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION INFLUENCED YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT CAREER LADDER PLANS.

1	2	3	4	5
highly negative influence	somewhat negative influence	no influence	somewhat positive influence	highly positive influence

15. ONE OF THE MOST IMPORTANT FACTORS LEADING TO THE DECISION NOT TO IMPLEMENT A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN WAS THE INCREASED COST TO THE DISTRICT IN ORDER TO SUPPLEMENT CURRENT TEACHER SALARIES.

1. Yes 2. No

16. IN WHAT WAY WAS THE CAREER LADDER PLAN FORMALLY INTRODUCED TO YOU IN YOUR DISTRICT?

1. presented at a state sponsored workshop
2. presented through a district workshop
3. has not been formally presented to me
4. other (indicate) _____

17. YOUR DISTRICT HAS DECIDED NOT TO IMPLEMENT A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN DURING THE 86-87 SCHOOL YEAR. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING BEST DESCRIBES HOW THE DECISION WAS REACHED? (Please circle the number of the most appropriate response.)

1. A district committee of teachers, principals, and central office administrators studied Career Ladder issues and models and made a recommendation to the board.

2. A district committee of principals and central office administrators studied Career Ladder issues and models and made a recommendation to the board.

3. A district committee of building administrators studied Career Ladder issues and models and made a recommendation to the board.

4. District administrators reviewed the state Career Ladder Plan Model and made a recommendation to the board without formal committee input from teaching staff.

5. District Board of Education members reviewed the state Career Ladder Plan Model and made the decision not to participate without formal committee input from central administration or teaching staff.

6. Other (PLEASE EXPLAIN): _____
_____
_____
_____

18. IN YOUR OPINION, THE REASONS WHY YOUR DISTRICT DID NOT DEVELOP A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN INCLUDE: (Please circle the number of no more than 3 responses.)

1. all teachers would not receive recognition
2. would not encourage excellence in education
3. would not enhance student learning
4. percent of state contribution was a factor
5. political pressure
6. teachers resistance to participation
7. administrators resistance to participation
8. superintendent recommendation
9. would not help to attract qualified teacher applicants
10. other (indicate) _____

19. HOW MANY TEACHERS ARE ASSIGNED TO YOUR BUILDING? _____

20. IN YOUR ESTIMATION, HOW MANY TEACHERS IN YOUR BUILDING WOULD BE ELIGIBLE TO PARTICIPATE IN THE CAREER LADDER PLAN? _____

21. OF THOSE DESCRIBED IN ITEM 20, WHAT PERCENT DO YOU BELIEVE WOULD APPLY FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN? _____%.

22. CIRCLE THE THREE (3) ITEMS ON THE FOLLOWING LIST WHICH YOU BELIEVE WOULD MOST LIKELY MOTIVATE TEACHERS TO PARTICIPATE IN A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN.

1. challenge
2. greater responsibility
3. opportunity to participate in district level activities
4. recognition
5. additional compensation
6. self-evaluation of performance
7. setting own goals
8. student achievement
9. other (indicate) _____

23. WHAT IS YOUR OPINION ABOUT THE APPROPRIATENESS OF THE PERFORMANCE BASED TEACHER EVALUATION BEING A REQUIRED PART OF THE CAREER LADDER MODEL? (Please circle the number of the appropriate response.)

1	2	3	4	5
very inappropriate	inappropriate	indifferent	appropriate	very appropriate

24. WHO IS PRIMARILY RESPONSIBLE FOR TEACHER EVALUATIONS? (Please circle the number of as many responses as are appropriate)

1. Principal
2. Superintendent
3. Assistant Principal
4. Supervisor
5. Teacher Teams
6. Teacher/Administrator Team
7. Other (indicate) _____

_____

USING THE FOLLOWING CODE, PLEASE RESPOND TO EACH STATEMENT BY PLACING IN THE BLANK THE NUMBER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS.

1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=indifferent, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree

A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN WILL TEND TO:

___25. increase competition among teachers.

___26. increase respect for teachers.

___27. be too complicated.

___28. be too political.

___29. foster individual effort.

___30. recognize team effort

___31. discourage sharing of material and ideas among teachers.

___32. cause teachers to be less open and cooperative with each other.

___33. motivate only those who are already motivated.

___34. recognize excellence in teaching.

___35. create a climate adverse to student learning.

USING THE FOLLOWING CODE, PLEASE RESPOND TO EACH STATEMENT BY PLACING IN THE BLANK THE NUMBER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS.

1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=indifferent, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree

A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN WILL TEND TO:

___36. cause teachers to remain in the classroom.

___37. encourage excellent teachers to remain in the system.

___38. cause money and status to become more important than teaching itself.

___39. encourage teachers to leave the classroom.

___40. cause teachers to spend more time on administrative tasks and less time on teaching.

___41. increase student learning.

___42. increase professionalism among teachers.

___43. cause students and parents to request Career Ladder teachers rather than those who are not on the Ladder.

___44. focus on classroom teaching.

___45. cause nonparticipants to be thought of as less effective teachers.

___46. define what it means to be a good teacher.

___47. create a quota system relating to the number of teachers who can participate in each stage of the Plan.

___48. lower teacher and student morale.

___49. discourage beginning teachers because five years is too long to wait in order to participate.

___50. encourage higher quality teacher applicants to seek employment in the district.

___51. decrease cooperativeness among teachers with administrators.

USING THE FOLLOWING CODE, PLEASE RESPOND TO EACH STATEMENT BY PLACING IN THE BLANK THE NUMBER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS.

1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=indifferent, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree

___52. Including only teachers, counselors and librarians for participation in the Career Ladder Plan is appropriate.

___53. The salary supplements allowed by the Excellence in Education Act of 1985 for successfully participating in a District Career Ladder Plan are inadequate compensation for the additional work requirements.

___54. A teacher having an individual choice to participate or not participate in a District Career Ladder Plan is appropriate.

___55. The Career Ladder Plan is basically a reward system for superior teaching.

___56. A district should participate in a District Career Ladder Plan because the plan should enhance instruction, improve curriculum development, and improve student learning in the district.

___57. Because a District Career Ladder Plan should be promoting professional growth, a teacher should participate.

___58. According to the wording of the Missouri law pertaining to Career Ladders, "any teacher who declines to participate shall not be penalized in any way." This will be honored in our district.

___59. There is apathy among my colleagues about participation in the District Career Ladder Plan.

___60. Career Ladder Plan guidelines should be drawn up so that teachers know what is expected of them.

___61. Provisions should be made for additional compensation for Administrators to recognize the increase in work and paper load.

___62. The State of Missouri should establish a Career Ladder Plan for Administrators.

___63. Parents should be included in the development and implementation of a District Career Ladder Plan.

___64. Over the next five years, District Career Ladder Plans will help retain high quality teachers in Missouri.

___65. Over the next five years, District Career Ladder Plans will help improve the quality of instruction for students in Missouri.

USING THE FOLLOWING CODE, PLEASE PLACE IN THE BLANK, THE NUMBER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS.

1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=indifferent, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree

___66. Over the next five years, District Career Ladder Plans will help improve teacher professionalism in Missouri.

___67. Over the next five years, District Career Ladder Plans will help improve student achievement in Missouri.

68. THE PURPOSE OF THE CAREER LADDER PORTION OF THE EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION ACT OF 1985 WAS TO RETAIN HIGH QUALITY TEACHERS IN MISSOURI CLASSROOMS. IF YOU BELIEVE THERE ARE MORE APPROPRIATE WAYS TO ACHIEVE THIS GOAL, PLEASE DESCRIBE THEM BELOW.

THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO RESPOND TO THIS SURVEY.

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-COLUMBIA

College of Education

Office of the Dean

[illegible]
Columbia, MO 65211-0211
Telephone (314) 882-8311

October 3, 1986

Dear Superintendent

Career Ladders is a new concept in Missouri. When the Missouri State Legislature passed the "career ladder" legislation in the spring of 1985, there were expectations that a large percentage of school districts in Missouri would choose to participate in the program. This has not been the case during 1986-87, with less than seventy districts being involved. To understand why some districts did, or did not, participate and to understand the attitudes of teachers, principals, superintendents and school board members regarding career ladders is critical information for legislators and educators as they explore future directions. The purpose of the enclosed survey is to identify those reasons and attitudes.

This study is a joint effort between the Missouri House of Representatives and the University of Missouri-Columbia, College of Education, Office of Research and Development, with funding from the National Conference of State Legislatures' Committee on Education and Labor. It is anticipated that the results of this study will reach beyond Missouri to also benefit other states that are studying the issues of career ladders and teacher incentive programs.

We know that to ask you to take 20-30 minutes to complete a survey is an imposition on your time; yet, your responses are essential. We would appreciate your responding to the items and then returning the survey in the enclosed envelope. Your perceptions will, of course, be anonymous. We need and value your thoughts.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Richard C. Schofer
Project Director

Jeanette C. Murphy
Research Associate

Jerry Valentine
Project Coordinator

THE MISSOURI CAREER LADDER IMPLEMENTATION SURVEY
SUPERINTENDENT FORM N

PURPOSE OF THE SURVEY IS TO IDENTIFY THE REASONS FOR DISTRICT PARTICIPATION OR NONPARTICIPATION IN THE CAREER LADDER PROGRAM AS SET FORTH IN MISSOURI LAW WITHIN THE EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION ACT OF 1985.

TO ASSIST YOU WITH YOUR RESPONSES TO THIS SURVEY, A BRIEF OUTLINE OF THE MISSOURI CAREER LADDER PLAN MODEL AS WELL AS A COPY OF THE ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR CAREER LADDER TEACHERS ARE ATTACHED.

PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER OF THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE.

1. Degree(s): (1) Bachelor
(2) Master
(3) Master's Plus
(4) Specialist
(5) Doctorate

2. Sex: (1) Male
(2) Female

3. Age: (1) 21 or under
(2) 24-29
(3) 30-34
(4) 35-39
(5) 40-44
(6) 45-49
(7) 50-54
(8) 55-59
(9) 60 or older

4. Years teaching experience: (1) 5 or less
(2) 6-10 years
(3) 11-15 years
(4) 16 or more

5. Years experience as a Superintendent: (1) 5 years or less
(2) 6-10 years
(3) 11-15 years
(4) 16 years or more

6. Years Superintendent in this district (include current year): (1) 5 years or less
(2) 6-10 years
(3) 11-15 years
(4) 16 years or more

7. Classification of district in which you are the Superintendent:
(1) Metropolitan (St. Louis City)
(2) Urban (Kansas City, Springfield, Independence, St. Joseph)
(3) Six-director: Jackson or St. Louis counties
(4) Six-director: containing a city of 25,000 to 70,000
(5) Six-director: containing a city of 5,000 to 24,999
(6) Six-director: containing a city of less than 5,000
(7) Special school district

8. Salary level:
(1) less than $20,000
(2) $20,000-24,999
(3) 25,000-29,999
(4) $30,000-34,999
(5) $35,000-39,999
(6) $40,000 or more

9. Number of students enrolled in your district as of October 1, 1986:
   (1) 800 or less
   (2) 801-900
   (3) 801-1500
   (4) 1501-3000
   (5) 3001-5000
   (6) 5001-10000
   (7) 10001-15000
   (8) 15001 or more

10. Classification of your district
   (1) AAA
   (2) AA
   (3) A

11. WHAT IS THE CURRENT YEAR'S TEACHER/STUDENT RATIO (CLASS SIZE) IN YOUR DISTRICT?

1	2	3	4	5
1 teacher/ 10 or less students	1 teacher/ 11-20 students	1 teacher/ 21-25 students	1 teacher/ 26-30 students	1 teacher/ 31 or more students

12. WHAT WAS THE AVERAGE PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE (EXCLUSIVE OF CAPITAL OUTLAY) FOR EACH STUDENT IN YOUR DISTRICT DURING THE 1985-86 SCHOOL YEAR?

1	2	3	4	5	6
$500 or less	$501 $1000	$1001 $1500	$1501 $2000	$2001 $2500	$2501 or more

13. WHEN YOU FIRST BECAME AWARE THAT THE STATE OF MISSOURI WAS CONSIDERING A CAREER DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR TEACHERS AS STATE POLICY (SUBSEQUENTLY THE CAREER LADDER PLAN), WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING WAS THE SOURCE OF YOUR INFORMATION. (Please circle the number of as many responses as are appropriate.)

1. informal discussion with other Superintendents
2. newspaper
3. television
4. radio
5. professional magazines
6. professional organization meetings
7. legislative meetings
8. legislative communiques
9. Department of Elementary and Secondary Education bulletins
10. Department of Elementary and Secondary Education workshops
11. other (indicate) _____

For questions 14-17 please circle the number of the most appropriate response.

14. INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH PUBLICITY FROM OTHER DISTRICTS OR STATES INFLUENCED YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT CAREER LADDER PLANS.

1	2	3	4	5
highly negative influence	somewhat negative influence	no influence	somewhat positive influence	highly positive influence

15. INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION INFLUENCED YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT CAREER LADDER PLANS.

1	2	3	4	5
highly negative influence	somewhat negative influence	no influence	somewhat positive influence	highly positive influence

16. ONE OF THE MOST IMPORTANT FACTORS LEADING TO THE DECISION TO NOT IMPLEMENT A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN WAS THE INCREASED COST TO THE DISTRICT IN ORDER TO SUPPLEMENT CURRENT TEACHER SALARIES.

1. Yes 2. No

17. IN WHAT WAY WAS THE CAREER LADDER PLAN FORMALLY INTRODUCED TO YOU IN YOUR DISTRICT?

1. presented at a state sponsored workshop
2. presented through a district workshop
3. has not been formally presented to me
4. other (indicate) _____

18. YOUR DISTRICT HAS DECIDED NOT TO IMPLEMENT A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN DURING THE 86-87 SCHOOL YEAR. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING BEST DESCRIBES HOW THIS DECISION WAS REACHED? (Please circle the number of the most appropriate response.)

1. A district committee of teachers, principals, and central office administrators studied Career Ladder issues and models and made a recommendation to the board.

2. A district committee of principals and central office administrators studied Career Ladder issues and models and made a recommendation to the board.

3. A district committee of building administrators studied Career Ladder issues and models and made a recommendation to the board.

4. District administrators reviewed the state Career Ladder Plan Model and made a recommendation to the Board without formal committee input from teaching staff

5. District Board of Education members reviewed the state Career Ladder Plan Model and made the decision not to participate without formal committee input from central administration or teaching staff

6. Other (PLEASE EXPLAIN): _____

19. DOES YOUR DISTRICT HAVE A COMMITTEE CURRENTLY STUDYING A CAREER LADDER SYSTEM?

1. Yes 2. No

20. DO YOU BELIEVE YOUR DISTRICT WILL IMPLEMENT A CAREER LADDER PROGRAM NEXT YEAR (1987-88 SCHOOL TERM)?

1. Yes 2. No

21. IN YOUR OPINION, THE REASONS WHY YOUR DISTRICT DID NOT DEVELOP A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN INCLUDE: (Please circle the number of no more than 3 responses.)

1. teacher resistance
2. percent of state contribution was a factor
3. criteria were not adequate
4. uncertainty about outcome for low performance teachers
5. political pressure
6. differences in opinion among members of the Board of Education
7. would take too much time to plan
8. would take too much time to implement
9. not certain it would increase student learning
10. would create an elite group of teachers
11. just a few would be recognized
12. future costs contained in the Excellence in Education Act
13. the possibility of the state lowering the stipend
14. voters voted down the levy
15. superintendent recommended against it
16. lack of interest shown by the Board of Education
17. other (indicate) _____

22. HOW MANY CLASSROOM TEACHERS ARE EMPLOYED IN YOUR DISTRICT? _____

24. OF THIS NUMBER, APPROXIMATELY HOW MANY TEACHERS IN YOUR DISTRICT MEET THE REQUIREMENT OF TEACHING 5 YEARS AND WOULD BE ELIGIBLE TO APPLY FOR PARTICIPATION IN A CAREER LADDER PLAN? _____

25. OF THOSE DESCRIBED IN ITEM 24, WHAT PERCENT DO YOU BELIEVE WOULD APPLY FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN?
_____ %

26. DID YOUR DISTRICT PROPOSE A LEVY INCREASE TO SUPPORT THE CAREER LADDER PLAN?

1. Yes 2. No

27. IF NOT, DOES YOUR DISTRICT PLAN TO SUBMIT A LEVY PROPOSAL IN ORDER TO SUPPORT THE CAREER LADDER PLAN?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Undecided

28. CIRCLE THE THREE (3) ITEMS ON THE FOLLOWING LIST WHICH YOU BELIEVE WOULD MOST LIKELY MOTIVATE TEACHERS TO PARTICIPATE IN A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN.

1. challenge
2. greater responsibility
3. opportunity to participate in district level activities
4. recognition
5. additional compensation
6. self-evaluation of performance
7. setting own goals
8. student achievement
9. other (indicate) _____

29. WHAT IS YOUR OPINION ABOUT THE APPROPRIATENESS OF THE PERFORMANCE BASED TEACHER EVALUATION BEING A REQUIRED PART OF THE CAREER LADDER MODEL? (Please circle the number of the appropriate response.)

1	2	3	4	5
very inappropriate	inappropriate	indifferent	appropriate	very appropriate

30. WHO IS PRIMARILY RESPONSIBLE FOR TEACHER EVALUATIONS? (Please circle the number of as many responses as are appropriate)

1. Principal
2. Superintendent
3. Assistant Principal
4. Supervisor
5. Teacher Teams
6. Teacher/Administrator Team
7. Other (indicate) _____
_____

USING THE FOLLOWING CODE, PLEASE RESPOND TO EACH STATEMENT BY PLACING IN THE BLANK THE NUMBER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS.

1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=indifferent, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree

A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN WILL TEND TO:

___30. increase competition among teachers.

___31. increase respect for teachers.

___32. be too complicated.

___33. be too political.

___34. foster individual effort.

___35. recognize team effort.

___36. discourage sharing of material and ideas among teachers.

___37. cause teachers to be less open and cooperative with each other.

___38. motivate only those who are already motivated.

___39. recognize excellence in teaching.

___40. create a climate adverse to student learning.

___41. cause teachers to remain in the classroom.

___42. encourage excellent teachers to remain in the system.

___43. cause money and status to become more important than teaching itself.

___44. encourage teachers to leave the classroom.

___45. cause teachers to spend more time on administrative tasks and less time on teaching.

___46. increase student learning.

___47. increase professionalism among teachers.

___48. cause students and parents to request Career Ladder teachers rather than those who are not on the Ladder.

___49. focus on classroom teaching.

___50. cause nonparticipants to be thought of as less effective teachers.

USING THE FOLLOWING CODE, PLEASE RESPOND TO EACH STATEMENT BY PLACING IN THE BLANK THE NUMBER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS.

1 strongly disagree, 2 disagree, 3 indifferent, 4 agree, 5 strongly agree

A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN WILL TEND TO:

___51. define what it means to be a good teacher.

___52. create a quota system relating to the number of teachers who can participate in each stage of the Plan.

___53. lower teacher and student morale.

___54. discourage beginning teachers because five years is too long to wait in order to participate.

___55. encourage higher quality teacher applicants to seek employment in the district.

___56. decrease cooperativeness among teachers with administrators.

USING THE FOLLOWING CODE, PLEASE RESPOND TO EACH STATEMENT BY PLACING IN THE BLANK THE NUMBER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS.

1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=indifferent, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree

___57. Including only teachers, counselors and librarians for participation in the Career Ladder Plan is appropriate.

___58. The salary supplements allowed by the Excellence in Education Act of 1985 for successfully participating in a District Career Ladder Plan are inadequate compensation for the additional work requirements.

___59. A teacher having an individual choice to participate or not participate in a District Career Ladder Plan is appropriate.

___60. The Career Ladder Plan is basically a reward system for superior teaching.

___61. A district should participate in a District Career Ladder Plan because the plan should enhance instruction, improve curriculum development, and improve student learning in the district.

___62. Because a District Career Ladder Plan should be promoting professional growth, a teacher should participate.

___63. According to the wording of the Missouri law pertaining to Career Ladders, "any teacher who declines to participate shall not be penalized in any way." This will be honored in our district.

USING THE FOLLOWING CODE, PLEASE PLACE IN THE BLANK, THE NUMBER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS.

1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=indifferent, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree

___64. There is apathy among our teachers about participation in the District Career Ladder Plan.

___65. The State of Missouri should establish a Career Ladder Plan for Administrators.

___66. Parents should be included in the development and implementation of a District Career Ladder Plan.

___67. Career Ladder Plan guidelines should be drawn up so that teachers know what is expected of them.

___68. Provisions should be made for additional compensation for Administrators to recognize the increase in work and paper load.

___69. Over the next five years, District Career Ladder Plans will help retain high quality teachers in Missouri.

___70. Over the next five years, District Career Ladder Plans will help improve the quality of instruction for students in Missouri.

___71. Over the next five years, District Career Ladder Plans will help improve teacher professionalism in Missouri.

___72. Over the next five years, District Career Ladder Plans will help improve student achievement in Missouri.

73. THE PURPOSE OF THE CAREER LADDER PORTION OF THE EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION ACT OF 1985 WAS TO RETAIN HIGH QUALITY TEACHERS IN MISSOURI CLASSROOMS. IF YOU BELIEVE THERE ARE MORE APPROPRIATE WAYS TO ACHIEVE THIS GOAL, PLEASE DESCRIBE THEM BELOW.

THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO RESPOND TO THIS SURVEY.

USING THE FOLLOWING CODE, PLEASE PLACE IN THE BLANK, THE NUMBER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS.

1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=indifferent, 4 agree, 5 strongly agree

___64. There is apathy among our teachers about participation in the District Career Ladder Plan.

___65. The State of Missouri should establish a Career Ladder Plan for Administrators.

___66. Parents should be included in the development and implementation of a District Career Ladder Plan.

___67. Career Ladder Plan guidelines should be drawn up so that teachers know what is expected of them.

___68. Provisions should be made for additional compensation for Administrators to recognize the increase in work and paper load.

___69. Over the next five years, District Career Ladder Plans will help retain high quality teachers in Missouri.

___70. Over the next five years, District Career Ladder Plans will help improve the quality of instruction for students in Missouri.

___71. Over the next five years, District Career Ladder Plans will help improve teacher professionalism in Missouri.

___72. Over the next five years, District Career Ladder Plans will help improve student achievement in Missouri.

73. **THE PURPOSE OF THE CAREER LADDER PORTION OF THE EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION ACT OF 1985 WAS TO RETAIN HIGH QUALITY TEACHERS IN MISSOURI CLASSROOMS. IF YOU BELIEVE THERE ARE MORE APPROPRIATE WAYS TO ACHIEVE THIS GOAL, PLEASE DESCRIBE THEM BELOW.**

THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO RESPOND TO THIS SURVEY.

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-COLUMBIA

College of Education

Office of the Dean

[illegible]
Columbia, MO 65211 0001
Telephone (314) 882-8111

October 3, 1986

Dear President, Board of Education:

Career Ladders is a new concept in Missouri. When the Missouri State Legislature passed the "career ladder" legislation in the spring of 1985, there were expectations that a large percentage of school districts in Missouri would choose to participate in the program. This has not been the case during 1986-87, with less than seventy districts being involved. To understand why some districts did, or did not, participate and to understand the attitudes of teachers, principals, superintendents and school board members regarding career ladders is critical information for legislators and educators as they explore future directions. The purpose of the enclosed survey is to identify those reasons and attitudes.

This study is a joint effort between the Missouri House of Representatives and the University of Missouri-Columbia, College of Education, Office of Research and Development, with funding from the National Conference of State Legislatures' Committee on Education and Labor. It is anticipated that the results of this study will reach beyond Missouri to also benefit other states that are studying the issues of career ladders and teacher incentive programs.

We know that to ask you to take 20-30 minutes to complete a survey is an imposition on your time; yet, your responses are essential. We would appreciate your responding to the items and then returning the survey in the enclosed envelope. Your perceptions will, of course, be anonymous. We need and value your thoughts.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Richard C. Schofer
Project Director

Jearette C. Murphy
Research Associate

Jerry Valentine
Project Coordinator

THE MISSOURI CAREER LADDER IMPLEMENTATION SURVEY
BOARD OF EDUCATION FORM N

PURPOSE OF THE SURVEY IS TO IDENTIFY THE REASONS FOR DISTRICT PARTICIPATION OR NONPARTICIPATION IN THE CAREER LADDER PROGRAM AS SET FORTH IN MISSOURI LAW WITHIN THE EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION ACT OF 1985.

TO ASSIST YOU WITH YOUR RESPONSES TO THIS SURVEY, A BRIEF OUTLINE OF THE MISSOURI CAREER LADDER PLAN MODEL AS WELL AS A COPY OF THE ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR CAREER LADDER TEACHERS ARE ATTACHED.

PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER OF THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE.

1. Education: (1) high school diploma
(2) college degree
(3) vocational training
(4) other (indicate) ____

2. Years served on Board of Education:
(1) 3 years or less
(2) 4-6 years
(3) 7-9 years
(4) 10-12 years
(5) more than 12 years

3. Profession or occupation_____

4. Sex: (1) Male
(2) Female

5. Age: (1) 23 or under
(2) 24-29
(3) 30-34
(4) 35-39
(5) 40-44
(6) 45-49
(7) 50-54
(8) 55-59
(9) 60 or older

6. Classification of district in which you are a Board Member:
(1) Metropolitan (St. Louis City)
(2) Urban (Kansas City, Springfield, Independence, St. Joseph)
(3) Six-director: Jackson or St. Louis counties
(4) Six-director: containing a city of 25,000 to 70,000
(5) Six-director: containing a city of 5,000 to 24,999
(6) Six-director: containing a city of less than 5,000
(7) Special school district

7. WHEN YOU FIRST BECAME AWARE THAT THE STATE OF MISSOURI WAS CONSIDERING A CAREER DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR TEACHERS AS STATE POLICY (SUBSEQUENTLY THE CAREER LADDER PLAN), WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING WAS THE SOURCE OF YOUR INFORMATION. (Please circle the number of as many responses as are appropriate.)

1. informal discussion with other members of Boards of Education
2. newspaper
3. television
4. radio
5. professional magazines
6. professional organization meetings
7. district administration
8. legislative meetings
9. legislative communiques
10. Department of Elementary and Secondary Education bulletins
11. Department of Elementary and Secondary Education workshops
12. other (indicate) _____

For questions 8-11, please circle the number of the most appropriate response.

8. INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH PUBLICITY FROM OTHER DISTRICTS OR STATES INFLUENCED YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT CAREER LADDER PLANS.

1	2	3	4	5
highly negative influence	somewhat negative influence	no influence	somewhat positive influence	highly positive influence

9. INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION INFLUENCED YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT CAREER LADDER PLANS.

1	2	3	4	5
highly negative influence	somewhat negative influence	no influence	somewhat positive influence	highly positive influence

10. INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOUR SUPERINTENDENT INFLUENCED YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT CAREER LADDER PLANS.

1	2	3	4	5
highly negative influence	somewhat negative influence	no influence	somewhat positive influence	highly positive influence

11. IN WHAT WAY WAS THE CAREER LADDER PLAN FIRST FORMALLY INTRODUCED TO YOU IN YOUR DISTRICT?

1. presented at a state sponsored workshop
2. presented through a district workshop
3. has not been formally presented to me
4. other (indicate) _____

12. YOUR DISTRICT HAS DECIDED NOT TO IMPLEMENT A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN DURING THE 86-87 SCHOOL YEAR. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING BEST DESCRIBES HOW THAT DECISION WAS REACHED. (Please circle the number of the most appropriate response.)

1. A district committee of teachers, principals, and central office administrators studied Career Ladder issues and models and made a recommendation to the board.

2. A district committee of principals and central office administrators studied Career Ladder issues and models and made a recommendation to the board.

3. A district committee of building administrators studied Career Ladder issues and models and made a recommendation to the board.

4. District administrators reviewed the state Career Ladder Plan Model and made a recommendation to the board without formal committee input from teaching staff.

5. District Board of Education members reviewed the state Career Ladder Plan Model and made the decision not to participate without formal committee input from central administration or teaching staff.

6. Other (PLEASE EXPLAIN): _____

_____

_____

_____

13. IN YOUR OPINION, THE REASONS WHY YOUR DISTRICT DID NOT DEVELOP A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN INCLUDE: (Please circle the number of no more than 3 responses.)

1. teacher resistance
2. percent of state contribution was a factor
3. criteria were not adequate
4. uncertainty about outcome for low performance teachers
5. political pressure
6. differences in opinion among members of the Board of Education
7. takes too much time to plan
8. takes too much time to implement
9. not certain it will increase student learning
10. too limited
11. creates an elite group of teachers
12. just a few would be recognized
13. future costs contained in the Excellence in Education Act
14. the possibility of the state lowering the stipend
15. voters voted down the levy
16. superintendent recommended against it
17. lack of interest shown by the Board of Education
18. other (indicate) _____

For questions 14-16, please circle the number of the most appropriate response.

14. ONE OF THE MOST IMPORTANT FACTORS LEADING TO THE DECISION NOT TO IMPLEMENT A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN WAS THE ADDITIONAL COST TO THE DISTRICT IN ORDER TO SUPPLEMENT CURRENT TEACHER SALARIES.

1. Yes 2. No

15. DID YOUR DISTRICT PROPOSE A LEVY INCREASE TO SUPPORT THE CAREER LADDER PLAN?

1. Yes 2. No

16. IF NOT, DOES YOUR DISTRICT PLAN TO SUBMIT A LEVY PROPOSAL IN ORDER TO SUPPORT THE CAREER LADDER PLAN?

1. Yes 2. No 3. Undecided

17. CIRCLE THE THREE (3) ITEMS ON THE FOLLOWING LIST WHICH YOU BELIEVE WOULD MOST LIKELY MOTIVATE TEACHERS TO PARTICIPATE IN A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN.

1. challenge
2. greater responsibility
3. opportunity to participate in district level activities
4. recognition
5. additional compensation
6. self-evaluation of performance
7. setting own goals
8. student achievement
9. other (indicate) _____

18. WHAT IS YOUR OPINION ABOUT THE APPROPRIATENESS OF THE PERFORMANCE BASED TEACHER EVALUATION BEING A REQUIRED PART OF THE CAREER LADDER MODEL? (Please circle the number of the appropriate response.)

1	2	3	4	5
very inappropriate	inappropriate	indifferent	appropriate	very appropriate

19. WHO IS PRIMARILY RESPONSIBLE FOR TEACHER EVALUATIONS? (Please circle the number of as many responses as are appropriate)

1. Principal
2. Superintendent
3. Assistant Principal
4. Supervisor
5. Teacher Teams
6. Teacher/Administrator Team
7. Other (indicate) _____

USING THE FOLLOWING CODE, PLEASE RESPOND TO EACH STATEMENT BY PLACING IN THE BLANK THE NUMBER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS.

1-strongly disagree, 2-disagree, 3-indifferent, 4-agree, 5-strongly agree

A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER PLAN WILL TEND TO:

___20. increase competition among teachers.

___21. increase respect for teachers.

___22. be too complicated.

___23. be too political.

___24. foster individual effort.

___25. recognize team effort.

___26. discourage sharing of material and ideas among teachers.

___27. cause teachers to be less open and cooperative with each other.

___28. motivate only those who are already motivated.

___29. recognize excellence in teaching.

___30. create a climate adverse to student learning.

___31. cause teachers to remain in the classroom.

___32. encourage excellent teachers to remain in the system.

USING THE FOLLOWING CODE, PLEASE RESPOND TO EACH STATEMENT BY PLACING IN THE BLANK THE NUMBER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS.

1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=indifferent, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree

A DISTRICT CAREER LADDER WILL TEND TO:

___33. cause money and status to become more important than teaching itself.

___34. encourage teachers to leave the classroom.

___35. cause teachers to spend more time on administrative tasks and less time on teaching.

___36. increase student learning.

___37. increase professionalism among teachers.

___38. cause students and parents to request Career Ladder teachers rather than those who are not on the Ladder.

___39. focus on classroom teaching.

___40. cause nonparticipants to be thought of as less effective teachers.

___41. define what it means to be a good teacher.

___42. create a quota system relating to the number of teachers who can participate in each stage of the Plan.

___43. lower teacher and student morale.

___44. discourage beginning teachers because five years is too long to wait in order to participate.

___45. encourage quality teacher applicants to seek employment in the district.

___46. decrease cooperativeness among teachers with administrators.

USING THE FOLLOWING CODE, PLEASE RESPOND TO EACH STATEMENT BY PLACING IN THE BLANK THE NUMBER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS

1-strongly disagree, 2-disagree, 3-indifferent, 4-agree, 5-strongly agree

___47. Including only teachers, counselors and librarians for participation in the Career Ladder Plan is appropriate.

___48. The salary supplements allowed by the Excellence in Education Act of 1985 for successfully participating in a District Career Ladder Plan are inadequate compensation for the additional work requirements.

___49. A teacher having an individual choice to participate or not participate in a District Career Ladder Plan is appropriate.

___50. The Career Ladder Plan is basically a reward system for superior teaching.

___51. A district should participate in a District Career Ladder Plan because the plan should enhance instruction, improve curriculum development, and improve student learning in the district.

___52. Because a District Career Ladder Plan should be promoting professional growth, a teacher should participate.

___53. According to the wording of the Missouri law pertaining to Career Ladders, "any teacher who declines to participate shall not be penalized in any way." This will be honored in our district.

___54. There is apathy among our teachers about participation in the District Career Ladder Plan.

___55. The State of Missouri should establish a Career Ladder Plan for Administrators.

___56. Parents should be included in the development and implementation of a District Career Ladder Plan.

___57. Career Ladder Plan guidelines should be drawn up so that teachers know what is expected of them.

___58. Provisions should be made for additional compensation for Administrators to recognize the increase in work and paper load.

___59. Over the next five years, District Career Ladder Plans will help retain high quality teachers in Missouri.

USING THE FOLLOWING CODE, PLEASE PLACE IN THE BLANK, THE NUMBER WHICH BEST DESCRIBES THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS.

1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=indifferent, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree

___60. Over the next five years, District Career Ladder Plans will help improve the quality of instruction for students in Missouri.

___61. Over the next five years, District Career Ladder Plans will help improve teacher professionalism in Missouri.

___62. Over the next five years, District Career Ladder Plans will help improve student achievement in Missouri.

63. THE PURPOSE OF THE CAREER LADDER PORTION OF THE EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION ACT OF 1985 WAS TO RETAIN HIGH QUALITY TEACHERS IN MISSOURI CLASSROOMS. IF YOU BELIEVE THERE ARE MORE APPROPRIATE WAYS TO ACHIEVE THIS GOAL, PLEASE DESCRIBE THEM BELOW.

THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO RESPOND TO THIS SURVEY.

Questionnaire Matrix

Non-Participating 66 Districts				Participating 66 Districts			
TNP	PNP	SNP	BNP	TP	PP	SP	BP
1	1		1	1	1		1
2				2			
3	2	1		3	2	1	
4	3	2	4	4	3	2	4
5	4	3	5	5	4	3	5
6	5	4	2	6	5	4	2
7	6	5		7	6	5	
8	7	6	3	8	7	6	3
9	8	7	6	9	8	7	6
10	9	8		10	9	8	
	10	9			10	9	
	11	10			11	10	
		11				11	
		12				12	
11	12	13	7	11	12	13	7
12	13	14	8	12	13	14	8
13	14	15	9	13	14	15	9
14	16	17	11	14	16	17	11
	15	16	14		15	16	15

Questionnaire Matrix

Non-Participating 66 Districts				Participating 66 Districts			
TNP	PNP	SNP	BNP	TP	PP	SP	BP
			10				10
15	17	18	12	15	17	18	12
17	22	27	17	20	23	26	18
	19				20		
	20				21		
	21				22		
18	23	28	18	21	24	27	19
19	24	29	19	22	25	28	20
		19					
		20					
		22				21	
		23				22	
		24				23	
		25	15			24	16
		26	16			25	17
20	25	30	20	23	26	29	21
21	26	31	21	24	27	30	22
22	27	32	22	25	28	31	23
23	28	33	23	26	29	32	24
24	29	34	24	27	30	33	25
25	30	35	25	28	31	34	26
26	31	36	26	29	32	35	27
27	32	37	27	30	33	36	28

Questionnaire Matrix

Non-Participating 66 Districts				Participating 66 Districts			
TNP	FNP	SNP	BNP	TP	FP	SP	BP
29	33	38	28	31	34	37	29
29	34	39	29	32	35	38	30
30	35	40	30	33	36	39	31
31	36	41	31	43	37	40	32
32	37	42	32	35	38	41	33
33	38	43	33	36	39	42	34
34	39	44	34	37	40	43	35
35	40	45	35	38	41	44	36
36	41	46	36	39	42	45	37
37	42	47	37	40	43	46	38
38	43	48	38	41	44	47	39
39	44	49	39	42	45	48	40
40	45	50	40	43	46	49	41
41	46	51	41	44	47	50	42
42	47	52	42	45	48	51	43
43	48	53	43	46	49	52	44
44	49	54	44	47	50	53	45
45	50	55	45	48	51	54	46
	51	56	46		52	55	47
52	57	47	49	53	56	48	
47	53	58	48	50	54	57	49
48	54	59	49	51	55	58	50
49	55	60	50	52	56	59	51

Questionnaire Matrix

Non-Participating 66 Districts				Participating 66 Districts			
50	56	61	51	53	57	60	52
51	57	62	52	54	58	61	53
52	58	63	53	55	59	62	54
53	59	64	54	56	60	63	55
	60	67	57		61	66	58
	61	68	58		62	67	59
	62	65	55		63	64	56
	63	66	56		64	65	57
54	64	69	59	57	65	68	60
55	65	70	60	58	66	69	61
56	66	71	61	59	67	70	62
57	67	72	62	60	68	71	63
58	68	73	63	61	69	72	64

December, 1986
Districts With

District:_____
Person:_____

DISTRICTS THAT IMPLEMENTED CAREER LADDERS THIS YEAR
STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions:

Ask for the Superintendent: if not available then Assistant Superintendent if the district has one---ask for these people by name.

State the Purpose for calling:

"I am calling from Dr. Jerry Valentine's office at the University of Missouri in Columbia. We are in the final stages of a state-wide study of career ladders. As a part of that study we surveyed all superintendents and other key educational leaders across the state. We then randomly selected fifty superintendents for a brief follow-up interview. You were one of the fifty persons selected for a follow-up telephone interview. I will only be asking you a few quick questions about career ladders. Your responses and all other responses in this study will be treated anonymously and will be kept confidential. Will you answer a few general questions regarding career ladders for us?"

(IF ASKED for more specifics about the purpose of the study, you should explain that the study included surveys to teachers, principals, superintendents and board of education presidents from across the state. The specific purpose of the study was to determine why some districts chose to implement career ladder programs and others did not; to identify the methods used in the districts to make those decisions; and to determine the attitudes of educational personnel across the state regarding career ladders. Funding for the study is from the U.S. House of Representatives. The study is a joint project between the University of Missouri-Columbia College of Education Research Office and the Missouri House of Representatives Research Office.)

Questions:

1. Do you recall receiving a survey from Dr. Valentine and the UMC office of research in the past month?

   yes no

2. Did you complete and return that survey?

   yes no do not recall

3. According to our listing of districts that implemented career ladder plans this year, your district implemented a career ladder plan this year. Is that correct?

   yes no (if no, use other survey)

4. Why did your district decide to adopt a career ladder plan this year? (Interviewer: This is a critical questions--take time with it and probe if appropraite.)

5. Would you please briefly describe how you and your district made the DECISION TO HAVE a career ladder program? In other words: (Interviewer: Circle the appropriate response)

   a. Was it a joint decision to have a plan after discussions between you and the Board?

   b. Was it an administrative decision from your office which you recommended to the Board?

   c. Was a committee of teachers, administrators and others appointed to study the issue and make a recommendation to the board?

   d. Did the Board of Education decide without input from you or a committee and then inform you?

   e. Was it decided in a different manner? If so, please describe.

6. Was your career ladder PLAN DEVELOPED by a committee of teachers, administrators and others?

   yes no

   a. If not developed by a committee, then how was it developed?

7. A MODEL Career Ladder Plan was developed last year by a State Department of Education committee. Which of the following best describes the degree to which your district plan resembles the state MODEL.

   a. Identical to the state model.
   b. Similar to the state model, with only a few minor changes.
   c. Very different from the state model.

   ----If different from the Model, how different?

   ----What were the reasons for developing and adopting a model that was different from the state model?

8. Do you believe your career ladder plan will positively or negatively impact upon your PERFORMANCE EVALUATION program?

   Positively Negatively Not Sure

   a. Why do you feel that way?

9. What do you feel are the BENEFITS your district will gain from your career ladder plan?

10. What do you feel are the NEGATIVE ASPECTS of career ladders?

A final question:

11. What advise would you give to other district personnel who are trying to decide whether or not to implement a career ladder program next year?

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME AND FOR SHARING YOUR THOUGHTS. We hope to have the research study completed by Christmas. I'm sure you will be hearing the results at professional meetings, in state professional publications, and through the media.

December, 1986
Districts Without

District:_____
Person:_____

DISTRICTS THAT DID NOT IMPLEMENT CAREER LADDERS THIS YEAR
STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions:

Ask for the Superintendent: if not available then Assistant Superintendent if the district has one---ask for these people by name.

State the Purpose for calling:

"I am calling from Dr. Jerry Valentine's office at the University of Missouri in Columbia. We are in the final stages of a state-wide study of career ladders. As a part of that study we surveyed all superintendents and other key educational leaders across the state. We then randomly selected fifty superintendents for a brief follow-up interview. You were one of the fifty persons selected for a follow-up telephone interview. I will only be asking you a few quick questions about career ladders. Your responses and all other responses in this study will be treated anonymously and will be kept confidential. Will you answer a few general questions regarding career ladders for us?"

(IF ASKED for more specifics about the purpose of the study, you should explain that the study included surveys to teachers, principals, superintendents and board of education presidents from across the state. The specific purpose of the study was to determine why some districts chose to implement career ladder programs and others did not: to identify the methods used in the districts to make those decisions: and to determine the attitudes of educational personnel across the state regarding career ladders. Funding for the study is from the U.S. House of Representatives. The study is a joint project between the University of Missouri-Columbia College of Education Research Office and the Missouri House of Representatives Research Office.)

Questions:

1. Do you recall receiving a survey from Dr. Valentine and the UMC office of research in the past month?

   yes no

2. Did you complete and return that survey?

   yes no do not recall

3. According to our listing of districts that implemented career ladder plans this year, you district DID NOT IMPLEMENT a career ladder plan this year. Is that correct?

   yes, that is correct no (if no, use other survey)

4. Why did your district decide NOT to adopt a career ladder plan this year? (Interviewer: This is a critical question--take time with it and probe if appropriate.)

5. Would you please briefly describe HOW you and your district made the DECISION NOT to have a career ladder program? In other words: (Intreviewer: circle the appropriate response)

   a. Was it a joint decision not to have a plan after discussions between you and the Board?

   b. Was it an administrative decision from your office which you recommended to the Board?

   c. Was a committee of teachers, administrators and others appointed to study the issue and make a recommendation to the board?

   d. Did the Board of Education decide without input from you or a committee and then inform you?

   e. Was it decided in a different manner? If so, please describe.

6. Do you believe your district will implement a career ladder plan next year?

yes no not sure at this time

a. Why (or why not)?

7. Do you believe your district will implement a career ladder plan at some point in time after next year if the State continues to fund career ladders in the same manner career ladders are now funded? (If #6 was YES, skip this question.)

yes no not sure at this time

a. Why (or why not)?

8. Do you believe career ladder plans will positively or negatively impact upon PERFORMANCE EVALUATION programs in districts acorss the state?

Positively Negatively Not Sure

a. Why do you feel that way?

9. What do you feel are the POSITIVE ASPECTS of career ladders?

10. What do you feel are the NEGATIVE ASPECTS of career ladders?

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME AND FOR SHARING YOUR THOUGHTS. We hope to have the research study completed by Christmas. I'm sure you will be hearing the results at professional meetings, in state professional publications, and through the media.

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

CONTRASTING

PARTICIPATING AND NON-PARTICIPATING SCHOOL SYSTEMS

Teachers

Variable	Non Participating n	%	Participating n	%	N
Years Taught					
5 or less	45	11.57	72	13.58	
6 - 10 years	75	19.28	123	23.21	
11 - 15 years	114	29.31	139	26.23	
16 or more years	155	39.85	196	36.98	
Totals	389	42.33	530	57.67	919
Population Classification					
Metro	1	0.26	1	0.19	
Urban	74	19.47	120	23.26	
Jackson, St. Louis	38	10.00	29	5.62	
25,000 - 70,000	15	3.95	3	0.58	
5,000 - 24,999	118	31.05	65	12.60	
Less than 5,000	124	32.63	281	54.46	
Special school dist.	10	2.63	17	3.29	
*Totals	380	42.41	516	57.59	896

Principals

Variable	Non Participating n	%	Participating n	%	N
Years Teaching Experience					
5 or less	9	8.26	10	9.35	
6 - 10 years	19	17.43	24	22.43	
11 - 15 years	26	23.85	23	21.50	
16 or more years	55	50.46	50	46.73	
Totals	109	50.46	107	49.54	216
Population Classification					
Urban	6	5.36	12	10.71	
Jackson, St. Louis	11	9.82	7	6.25	
25,000 - 70,000	6	5.36	1	0.89	
5,000 - 24,999	29	25.89	7	6.25	
Less than 5,000	59	52.68	85	75.89	
Special school dist.	1	0.89	0	0.00	
*Totals	112	50.00	112	50.00	224

Variable	Board: Non Participating n	%	Participating n	%	N
Education					
H. S. Diploma	48	34.29	6	23.08	
College Degree	71	50.71	18	69.23	
Vocational Trng.	9	6.43	1	3.85	
Other	12	8.57	1	3.85	
Totals	140	84.34	26	15.66	166
Years on Board					
3 or less	22	15.94	7	26.92	
4 - 6 years	49	35.51	8	30.77	
7 - 9 years	39.	28.26	6	23.08	
10 - 12 years	17	12.32	3	11.54	
12 or more	11	7.97	2	7.69	
Totals	138	84.15	26	15.85	164
Population Classification					
Urban	3	2.16	0	0.00	
Jackson, St. Louis	10	7.19	1	3.85	
25,000 - 70,000	5	3.60	0	0.00	
5,000 - 24,999	24	17.27	3	11.54	
Less than 5,000	95	68.35	22	84.62	
Special school dist.	2	1.44	0	0.00	
Totals	139	84.24	26	15.76	165

Variable	Superintendent Non Participating n	%	Participating n	%	N
Years Teaching Experience					
5 or less	42	14.05	5	10.42	
6 - 10 years	38	12.71	3	6.25	
11 - 15 years	40	13.38	9	18.75	
16 or more years	179	59.87	31	64.58	
Totals	299	86.17	48	13.83	347
Population Classification					
Metro	1	0.32	0	0.00	
Urban	2	0.65	2	3.92	
Jackson, St. Louis	21	6.77	1	1.96	
25,000 - 70,000	8	2.58	0	0.00	
5,000 - 24,999	42	13.23	2	3.92	
Less than 5,000	236	73.13	46	90.20	
Special school dist.	1	0.32	0	0.00	
Totals	310	85.87	51	14.23	361

Superintendent					
Variable	Non Participating n	%	Participating n	%	N
Student Enrollment					
300 or less	51	16.24	6	11.76	
301 - 800	112	35.67	24	47.06	
801 - 1500	58	18.47	12	23.53	
1501 - 3000	49	15.61	5	9.80	
3001 - 5000	19	6.05	2	3.92	
5001 - 10,000	14	4.46	1	1.96	
10,000 - 15,000	7	2.23	1	1.96	
15,000 or more	4	1.27	0	0.00	
Totals	314	86.03	51	13.97	365
District Classification					
AAA	140	45.45	12	25.00	
AA	166	53.90	36	75.00	
U	2	0.65	0	0.00	
*Totals	308	86.52	48	13.48	356
Current Student-Teacher Ratio					
10 or less students	11	3.50	1	2.00	
11 - 20	181	57.64	26	52.00	
21 - 25	103	32.80	18	36.00	
26 - 30	19	6.05	5	10.00	
Totals	314	86.26	50	13.74	364

Variable	Superintendent Non Participating n	%	Participating n	%	N
Average Per Pupil Expenditure					
501 - 1000	2	0.65	0	0.00	
1001 - 1500	10	3.24	2	4.17	
1501 - 2000	48	15.53	6	12.50	
2001 - 2500	110	35.60	25	52.08	
2501 or more	139	44.98	15	31.25	
Totals	309	86.55	48	13.45	357

The Missouri Career Ladder

Adopted April 17, 1986, by the Missouri State Board of Education.

Participation in the Career Ladder is voluntary for school districts and for individual teachers, counselors and librarians. Only Stage I will be implemented during 1986-87.

STAGE I—$1,500

Qualifications	*Responsibilities*
1. Five years' teaching experience in Missouri public schools. 2. Appropriate certification. 3. Classroom teacher, librarian or guidance counselor serving on a regular-length, full-time contract. 4. PBTE.* Teacher meets "expected" level on the district's performance based teacher evaluation. 5. Teacher will prepare a Career Development Plan.	**Priority Responsibilities** Career Ladder teachers must select three of five of the following (at least one from each category): **Personal/Professional Growth** • Continue education • Participate in subject-area organization • Master's degree in field appropriate to teaching assignment. **Faculty Collaboration** • Model/demonstrate/share effective teaching strategies. **School/Community Involvement** • Promote parental involvement **Additional Responsibilities** • Career Ladder teachers must select three additional responsibilities. *See Appendix.* Career Stage I teachers will select a total of six responsibilities.

* *PBTE—Performance based teacher evaluation, as required under Section 168.128, RSMo.*

STAGE I

Qualifications

1. Successful completion of the Stage I Career Development Plan. Teacher must complete two years on Stage I. Local board of education may waive one year of this requirement based upon a total of seven years' prior experience.
2. Appropriate certification.
3. Regular-length, full-time contract.
4. PBTE.* Teacher meets and exceeds "expected" performance level on 10% of evaluation criteria.
5. Teacher will prepare a Career Development Plan. Responsibilities at Stage II must display higher levels of sophistication.

Model

Authority: House Bill 463
—The Excellence in Education Act of 1985
Sections 168.500-168.515, RSMo

	STAGE III—$5,000	
	Qualifications	*Responsibilities*
I—$3,000 *Responsibilities*	1. Successful completion of the Stage II Career Development Plan. Teacher must complete three years on Stage II. Local board of education may waive two years of this requirement based upon a total of 10 years' prior experience. 2. Appropriate certification. 3. Regular-length, full-time contract. 4. PBTE.* Teacher meets and exceeds "expected" performance level on 15% of evaluation criteria. 5. Teacher will prepare a Career Development Plan. Responsibilities at Stage III must display higher levels of sophistication.	**Priority Responsibilities** Career Ladder teachers must select four of eight of the following (at least one from each category): **Personal/Professional Growth** • Continue education • Participate in subject-area organization • Master's degree in field appropriate to teaching assignment. **Faculty Collaboration** • Model/demonstrate/share effective teaching strategies. **School/Community Involvement** • Promote parental involvement • Develop curriculum • Participate with school committees • Instructional improvement projects **Additional Responsibilities** • Career Ladder teachers must select four additional responsibilities (at least one from each category). Responsibilities must reflect higher levels of sophistication. *See Appendix.* Career Stage III teachers will select a total of eight responsibilities.
Priority Responsibilities Career Ladder teachers must select four of seven of the following (at least one from each category): **Personal/Professional Growth** • Continue education • Participate in subject-area organization • Master's degree in field appropriate to teaching assignment. **Faculty Collaboration** • Model/demonstrate/share effective teaching strategies. **School/Community Involvement** • Promote parental involvement • Develop curriculum • Participate with school committees **Additional Responsibilities** • Career Ladder teachers must select three additional responsibilities (at least one from each category). Responsibilities must reflect higher levels of sophistication. *See Appendix.* Career Stage II teachers will select a total of seven responsibilities.	*Appendix.* State guidelines for the career ladder program include an appendix. It is a listing of suggested or possible activities from which teachers may choose in meeting the "additional responsibilities" requirement at each stage of the career ladder.	

Appendix F

Appendix
Additional Responsibilities and Opportunities for Career Ladder Teachers

Personal/Professional Growth

Prepare applied research/development projects

Serve as a leader in a national, state, and/or local subject area organization

Serve in an advisory capacity to higher education programs

Maintain membership in an honorary professional organization

Develop and submit a proposal for the Incentives for School Excellence Grant program

Faculty Collaboration

Assist preservice teachers

Serve as a mentor/advisor to a new teacher

Serve on a professional development committee

Develop and share instructional strategies/programs

Conduct professional presentations, e.g., workshops, speeches, seminars

Develop and/or coordinate buildingwide student academic programs, e.g., fairs, exhibitions, competitions

Serve as a department/grade-level chairperson

Serve as a subject area coordinator

Serve on a career ladder committee

Coordinate, develop, and/or participate in teacher exchange programs

Provide leadership in a professional teacher organization or other school-related organizations

School/Community Involvement

Coordinate and/or serve in a student tutoring program

Develop and/or implement home/school communication process

Develop, coordinate or participate in summer programs

Membership/involvement/leadership in PTA/PTO organizations

Coordinate staff development workshops and programs, i.e., needs assessment, session development, evaluation

Present staff development workshops and programs

Develop curriculum at building and/or district level, e.g., participate or lead on committees, writing groups, needs assessment or evaluation, technological development

Participate or provide leadership for building or district committees, e.g., curriculum, advisory boards, subject area, grade level, textbook selection, self-study, school improvement councils

Develop, coordinate, and/or participate in school/business partnerships and/or school/community relationships

Develop, coordinate, and/or participate in instructional improvement projects

Develop and/or coordinate districtwide student academic programs, e.g., fairs, exhibitions, competitions

Coordinate or sponsor student activities, e.g., student government, homecoming ceremonies, graduation ceremonies, yearbook, newspaper

Develop or participate in special programs for students, e.g., remedial, enrichment, gifted, study groups

Implement a state-approved Incentives for School Excellence Grant project

Develop, coordinate or participate in building/district level pilot project

Presentations to community groups regarding district programs